Christian Fellowship Among the Nations

A Discussion Course for Young People and Adults

An Aid to Straight Thinking on our Greatest Problem

JEROME DAVIS and ROY B. CHAMBERLIN

BR
115
P4
D38
1925
GTU
Storage

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON CHICAGO

BERKELEY 9, CALIFORNIA

Gift of
A. M. A. Historical Library

GE

and to bring out clearly
is provided containing a
pamphlets are referred to
er will take note of these
to assign such topics to
them with the pamphlet
ed in this package are
authors recommend that
group. This material
and magazine articles as
(See *Bibliography*.)
ers to secure these partic-

etter of Salmon O. Levin-

Create and Adopt a Code
national Court to Make It

of
elations.

nd Is Not.

d Churches can do in the

ific Settlement of Interna-

reaty of Disarmament and

Raymond B. Fosdick. An Opening Chapter in World Cooperation.
Manley O. Hudson. American Cooperation with the League of Nations.
Manley O. Hudson. The Problem of the International Court Today.
League of Nations Non-Partisan Association. The Covenant of the League of Nations.
Lucia Ames Mead. What the Christian Church Needs to Know about War and Peace.
National Civil Liberties Bureau. The Individual and the State, the Problem as Presented by the Sentencing of Roger N. Baldwin.
National Council for Prevention of War. The Effort of the United States to Bring About World Peace.
National Council for Prevention of War. The Power of the Press for Peace and War.
National Council for Prevention of War. War and Peace in United States History Text Books.
Scott Nearing. Oil and the Germs of War.
Kirby Page. War, Its Causes, Consequences and Cure.
John Nevin Sayre. War is Unchristian, But—*including:*
George A. Coe. Shifting the National Mind-Set.
John Haynes Holmes. What Anyone Can Do.
The Secretary of War (prepared and published by direction of). Statement Concerning the Treatment of Conscientious Objectors in the Army.
William Austin Smith. War and the Churches.
Norman Thomas. The Challenge of War, an Economic Interpretation.
World Peace Foundation. America and the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Price Library Package $1.50

Boston THE PILGRIM PRESS Chicago

172.4
D262

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AMONG THE NATIONS

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AMONG THE NATIONS

A Discussion Course which will help Groups of Young People and Adults to do Straight Thinking on our Greatest Problem

JEROME DAVIS
Chair of Practical Philanthropy, Divinity School, Yale University

AND

ROY B. CHAMBERLIN
Minister, Church of Christ, Hanover, N. H.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

Property of CBSK
Please return to
Graduate Theological Union Library

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON CHICAGO

F 748.66
D2 H7

BR 25731
115
P4
D38
1925

COPYRIGHT 1925
BY SIDNEY A. WESTON

Printed in the United States of America

THE JORDAN & MORE PRESS
BOSTON

CONTENTS

Library Package — *Second Cover Page*
How to Use the Course . . . . . Page V

SESSION

I. Our Attitude toward "Patriotism" 1
II. Our Attitude toward "Patriotic" Education . . . 5
III. Our Attitude toward Other Races or Nations . . 10
IV. Our Attitude toward Economic Imperialism . . . 14
V. Our Attitude toward Diplomacy and International Organization 19
VI. Our Attitude toward the Great Destroyer . . . 23
VII. Our Attitude toward the Conscientious Objector . . 27
VIII. Our Attitude toward the "News" in Peace and War . 31
IX. Our Attitude toward Enemies 35
X. Our Attitude toward the Need of Europe . . . 38
XI. Shall the Church Support War? 42
XII. How Can the Church Support World Fellowship? . . 46
XIII. What Are We Going to do About It? 50

Appendix

Parable of the Rich Householder
World Politics and a Village Fire Department
Charles H. Levermore 57
The League of Nations at Four Years of Age
Charles H. Levermore 61
Church, State and War, Editorial in *The Christian Century* 65
Loyalty to Christ in Time of War, *Ernest Fremont Tittle* 70
The Conscientious Objector in America *Anton T. Boisen* 74
Armaments are Not a Police Force 77
The Growth of a Press Legend 78
Points of Strain between Japan and the United States
Sidney L. Gulick 79
Points of Strain between White and Negro Americans
George E. Haynes 84
Fear as the Foe of Peace . . . *Norman Thomas* 89
Economic Imperialism . . . . *Scott Nearing* 96
Peace Resolutions of the Churches 102
Organizations in the United States of America that Promote World Peace 112
Bibliography on War and the Peace Movement . . 114

HOW TO USE THE COURSE

The followers of Jesus are being summoned insistently to definite moral leadership in solving the problems of our times. Men are looking to the principles and the spirit of Jesus for guidance. This course of thirteen lessons is offered in the hope that it will clarify the thinking of Christian men and women in a field where passion and prejudice are so general, and will help to spread a spirit of Christian understanding and good will.

The purpose of the course is not to give a comprehensive knowledge of the subjects treated; if one were to read *all* the references given, one would scarcely begin to know the field. The purpose is, rather, to lead students to consider carefully their own attitudes on these moot questions; and to supplant narrow, bitter, un-Christian attitudes by really Christian ones. Moreover, we hope that the student may be sufficiently interested in the subject so that he will ally himself with some one of the many organizations working for international peace and good will (see *Appendix* for complete list); only so can his interest and action become permanently fruitful.

The method should explain itself. The cases given are all true incidents; in each one is a vital problem which Christians ought to be facing and solving in a Christian way. We have tried to present challenging questions growing out of these cases, in the hope that students will fight their way through to honest conclusions that are thoroughly intelligent and Christian.

A great responsibility rests upon the teacher. He (or she) should master thoroughly such of the material as can be secured. He should map out the entire class hour in advance; it would help immensely to write out answers to all questions. He should know the character and background of the class well enough so that he can emphasize questions and topics that are most vital to his own group. The teacher should also be prepared each hour to make assignments on the next

lesson, and to leave with the class a hint as to what is coming, to arouse interest. While we have tried to give abundant material, and to guide the thinking of students, yet above all we should like to have teacher and students do original work, and tackle these or other problems in their own way.

In each lesson there is a section suggesting various sources of information. The more time students can spend on reading and investigation, the better for them and for the class. The references are carefully chosen. The reprints in the *Appendix* of this booklet are especially important; the pamphlets, articles and books listed in the *Bibliography* should be used as far as possible. Much of this material can be found in libraries. Some excellent pamphlets, selected especially for this course, have been gathered in a LIBRARY PACKAGE and can be secured from the publishers of this course. The authors recommend that one PACKAGE be purchased for each study group. If a class has more than twelve members two LIBRARY PACKAGES should be ordered. In many cases individual members of classes will want to order the LIBRARY PACKAGE for their personal use. See second cover page for further announcement.

In the class, however, usually not more than one-third of the time should be devoted to reports on reading, speakers, etc. The method should be discussion. A skilfully used blackboard helps greatly. Teacher and students should both have a background of *facts;* then discussion, following the lines suggested by the questions, should lead through to honest, Christian conclusions. We hope that classes will not necessarily confine themselves to a single session on each lesson; these are big subjects, and tremendously important ones — the more time spent on them, the better.

We desire to acknowledge our debt to a large number of people who have studied and written upon these subjects. Especially are we grateful to Frederick J. Libby and Nevin Sayre for many definite and helpful suggestions.

JEROME DAVIS
ROY B. CHAMBERLIN

Christian Fellowship Among the Nations

SESSION I

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD "PATRIOTISM"

Murray Lawrence is a young minister, 28 years old, pastor of a community church in a small town where there is a "land grant" college. He served through the war in the heavy artillery, though he did not get to France. Since the war he has been increasingly impressed with the horrors of war, and has come to feel that war is utterly out of accord with the spirit of Christ.

On Sunday morning, November 11, 1923, Lawrence preached an Armistice Day sermon in his church. He portrayed with vivid dramatic power the "other side" of war, and stated that, if the Christian who believes in war would be consistent, he must picture Christ going over the top, using the bayonet, dropping poison-gas on undefended cities, sinking passenger ships, etc. He ended by saying that he agreed with Dr. Fosdick when he said, "The more I consider war . . . the more difficult I find it to imagine any situation in which I shall feel justified in sanctioning or participating in another war. . . . I never expect to bless another war."

Immediately a storm of criticism arose, although Mr. Lawrence's work had been of the finest, and he was well-nigh the idol of the community. One parishioner said, "He did more harm in thirty minutes than he has done good in three years." The local chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars attacked him, demanding a public retraction of his more extreme statements. The military officers of the college also joined the attack, one of them saying, "I am ashamed of such an utterance from our pulpit; it is an insult to the country, and a direct reflection upon the honor of every soldier in the Great War."

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Investigation

1. How are patriotic holidays usually celebrated in your town?

2. What definition of "patriotism" would the average man on the street in your community give? Ask a few different types of people, and report to the class their replies. What "patriotic" things have been *done* by your fellow-citizens in the last two years?

3. How do you actually feel toward Americans from other parts of the country? For example, the southern mountaineer, the miner of Ohio or West Virginia, the cowboy of the plains?

4. What sermons or addresses do you recall, like that described above, discussing fully the religious aspects of war?

Books

K. Page, *The Sword or the Cross*, p. 39

B. Russell, *Why Men Fight*

Pamphlets and Articles

R. Jones, *A More Excellent Way.*

* N. Thomas, *The Challenge of War*, pp. 1–9.

* K. Page, *War*, pp. 26–32.

C. H. Grabo, *The Sentiment of Patriotism*, *The World Tomorrow*, February, 1924. (396 Broadway, N. Y.)

Glenn Frank, *Americanism: Selective or Sentimental*, *Century Magazine*, November, 1924.

* *The Effort of the United States to Bring about World Peace*, National Council for the Prevention of War.

Note: Pamphlets marked with a (*) are included in the LIBRARY PACKAGE. See announcement on second cover page.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Consider the point of view of Mr. Lawrence, whose ancestry is American for many generations. Would you apply the adjective "patriotic" to his position, or to that of his critics, or to neither? Why?

2. At the 4th of July celebration at the Northfield Student Conference, in 1912, the West Point delegation, after

a little fancy marching, closed its "stunt" by unrolling a streamer on which was inscribed Stephen Decatur's famous toast,

"My country . . . may she ever be in the right; but right or wrong, my country!"

This familiar slogan usually means supporting whatever course the country embarks upon. Is it good Christianity? Good morality? Is it patriotic? Can you mention any recent measures of the government which you feel you cannot support?

3. On Armistice Day, 1923, a great many ministers preached sermons more or less like that of Mr. Lawrence. Do you think such an observance of the day is fitting and patriotic, in view of the fact that the date is the anniversary of the end of the "war to end war"? Why? Why not?

4. Suggest the most appropriate type of celebration for our national holidays — Fourth of July, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Armistice Day.

5. Samuel Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." What did he mean? Can you give any recent examples of the truth of such a striking statement?

6. In the article referred to above, C. H. Grabo says,

"Patriotism is a sentiment compounded of hate, of fear, of generous sacrifice, of righteous anger, of selfishness, of heroic resolve. . . . In the name of patriotism all evil is done: wars are made, cruelty is practised, intolerance is sanctified."

Do you agree with this statement? Can you give examples either to controvert it or to support it?

7. Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City, defines patriotism as follows:

"Patriotism is love of one's country, a desire to make one's country true and strong, a loyalty to its ideals and institutions, a fidelity to the principles which exalt a nation, a strenuous determination so to live and act as to maintain one's country's ideals and hand them down unimpaired to future generations."

What changes or additions would you make in this definition? Do you accept it?

8. In the light of above definition, discuss the "patriotism" of the actions of (1) those who accumulated great war profits; (2) the United States Naval Mission to Brazil;

(3) Messrs. Dougherty and Fall, etc., for actions brought to light in the investigations of the winter and spring of 1924; (4) the Quaker or other conscientious objector who, because of his religion, refuses to take part in war; (5) those who make incorrect income tax returns; (6) those who violate the prohibition laws; (7) politicians who make glowing campaign promises which they never intend to keep.

9. Read, in the pamphlet, *The Effort of the United States to Bring about World Peace*, the account of the work for peace of famous Americans, from Washington to Lincoln. Were these men " patriotic "? I. e., John Jay, who negotiated the world's first arbitration treaty? Benjamin Franklin, who said, " There never was a good war or a bad peace "?

10. A Kiwanis Club slogan is, " We build." Can you give a better short definition of patriotism?

11. Many people think of patriotism as meaning chiefly fighting for one's country. Compare that idea of patriotism with the sentiment of our two great national hymns, "My Country, 'tis of Thee," and " O Beautiful for Spacious Skies."

12. Do you consider a man who spends time and money for the Anti-Saloon League as patriotic as a soldier in the army?

13. Missionaries in Japan urged that our " Defence Day," September 12, 1924, be not observed, saying that it was making Japan suspicious and fearful. What is your judgment about its wisdom? About its " patriotism "?

14. Rear-Admiral Rogers, U. S. N., (retired) said at the Williamstown Institute of Politics, August, 1924, that when the population of the United States reaches two hundred million, if there is any manhood left in the American people the United States will go to war to keep our place in the world. Do you consider this " patriotic " advice? Why?

15. Accepting Dr. Jefferson's definition of patriotism, let the class list some of the outstanding " ideals and principles " of our country. Then let them list some things they as individuals can do to express " loyalty to these ideals " . . . and " fidelity to these principles."

16. There can of course be no " patriotism " of the right sort which does not express itself in our daily life. Patriotism means the finest citizenship right at home. Let the class make a list of the characteristics of the patriotic citizen and his activities.

SESSION II

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD "PATRIOTIC" EDUCATION

Case I. — The following are quotations made from certain elementary readers now in use in French schools: (Cf. Irwin, *Christ or Mars*, pp. 76–78.)

Concerning a Belgian boy from Dinant: "The poor child, whose mother is a refugee among us, has both his hands cut off. It is the Germans who have so martyred him. They have killed also his father, his sister and his big brother." In a Lorraine village some children are playing soldier; one aims a wooden gun at some Germans, and calls out "Aim! Fire!" "Is it possible? It is the turn of the brigands to be afraid! A seven-year-old child has made them tremble. A soldier points his piece at this audacious child. A shot sounds; the child falls, struck in the heart. O Germans! What a crime! What cowardice! Are there among you no fathers that love their children?" "Tell me, my son," said my mother . . . "you will not forget these crimes?" "I promise, mother!"

Case II. — The senate of New York state passed in 1923–24 a law which excluded from the schools of the state any book (1) which belittles or ridicules the accomplishments of American soldiers, sailors or marines . . . or leaves in the minds of youthful readers a contempt for the American soldiers, sailors, or marines . . . or an unwarranted skepticism regarding their successes . . . or (2) which impugns the motive or the motives that inspired the American soldiers, sailors or marines who fought in the wars waged by the United States. . . .

(Concrete cases from almost any of the great powers might have been included. As we now know, the educational system of pre-war Germany was built up on a basis of glorification of self and of imperialism.)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Investigation

Get copies of history text-books used in the schools of your town, and examine the sections covering the Great War — its causes, the part played by the United States, the picture given of the enemies, etc. — asking the questions, how much is nationalism, how much propaganda, how much is fact impartially recorded?

Read pamphlet, *War and Peace in United States History Text Books.* (See LIBRARY PACKAGE.)

Speaker

The class may invite a school teacher of history to tell what her real purpose is in teaching her subject, and where she gets her facts, apart from the text-book.

Books

B. Kidd, *Science of Power* (for the use of education in Germany.)

F. Nitti, *Decadence of Europe*

W. Irwin, *Christ or Mars*, Chs. 4 and 5

O. Wister, *Pentecost of Calamity*

Pamphlets

* K. Page, *War.*

* N. Thomas, *The Challenge of War*, pp. 8, 9.

* S. Nearing, *Oil and the Germs of War.*

* *War and Peace in United States History Text Books*, National Council for Prevention of War.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Review the conclusions reached in Session I.

2. What type of person do you think prepared the French text-books from which quotations are made? For what purpose? Is the picture drawn there true? (Both ex-Premier Nitti, of Italy, and Mr. Lloyd-George have stated in print that careful investigations could find no authentic case of Belgian children with hands cut off.) Is it patriotic?

Clemenceau, the French war premier, is reported to have said that, since there is so much hate propaganda in the history books in the schools, it would be a good thing if all elementary history courses were stopped for seven years. Do you agree with him?

3. What do you think will be the effect of the use of these text-books on French children? What will their attitude probably be toward Germany later on? Will it dispose them to suspicion and war, or to peace and cooperation? Will it be for the ultimate well-being of France? Of Germany? Of the whole world?

4. What type of person do you think drew up the New York State Law? For what purpose? Is it "history" which this law would have taught? Is it patriotism?

5. What is the purpose of the "ritual of patriotism" in the schools — salute to the flag, patriotic songs, observance of holidays, etc.? What is its effect? Does it predispose children to military training and war, or to peace? Why? Is it really patriotic? What suggestions could you make for its improvement?

6. Let some member of the class report on the educational system of Germany from 1875 to 1914. What was the effect on the mind and spirit of that people? (Cf. B. Kidd, *Science of Power*, especially Ch. IV; O. Wister, *Pentecost of Calamity*, pp. 59–100.)

7. Recall the teaching you had in school about the Revolutionary War and the conduct of England then, and at later periods of our history. An anonymous English writer spoke in 1920 of ". . . the scorn of England — a disdain still instilled into the young in American schools by the teachers. . . ." *The Taint in Politics*, p. 131.

What is the resultant attitude toward England? In the bottom of your heart are you friendly, or suspicious and hostile? Note the difficulty with which a friendly feeling toward England has been built up during and since the war. Is such teaching of history truly patriotic?

8. The following paragraph is taken from the end of Montgomery's 7th-grade school history:

"Here in the United States every advantage is open. Education is absolutely free. Millions of acres of Western lands are still open to settlement. Here, and here only, among leading civilized nations, no colossal standing army

eats up the daily earnings of the people. Here every law springs, or may spring, directly from the will of the majority."

All but one of the statements in the above paragraph are either partially or wholly untrue. Criticize them all. Is this boastful and arrogant Americanism a fair sample of the kind of " history " taught in our schools? Will it tend to make our boys and girls good world-citizens? What kind of adult citizens does such teaching produce? What kind do we want? Is such teaching really patriotic?

9. Let a member of the class report on the pamphlet, *War and Peace in United States History Text Books*. Read aloud in class the summary on p. 11. Why the over-emphasis on wars? Of which are you more proud, the achievements of the country in war, or in and for peace? Why?

10. Do you believe with Theodore Roosevelt that history books can be so fair and just that they could be used impartially in American and English schools? (Cf. above pamphlet, p. 3.) Would such international histories be a help to world-peace?

11. The attitudes which are developed in school children will probably be permanent. Let the class list certain attitudes, which you would call " patriotic " under our definition, which you would like to have developed in the children of your town — toward our country; toward the late enemies of the country; toward military training and preparedness; toward war; toward the countries of Europe and Asia; toward the Philippines, Mexico, Central America. Are your schools developing such attitudes?

12. What can the class do, either as a class or as individuals, to help the situation? How many of the following statements is the class willing to adopt? Will you train your children in such beliefs?

A significant declaration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is its statement of International Ideals, adopted at its meeting in Chicago, in December, 1921:

1. We believe that nations no less than individuals are subject to God's immutable moral laws.

2. We believe that nations achieve true welfare, greatness, and honor only through just dealing and unselfish service.

3. We believe that nations that regard themselves as Christian have special international obligations.

4. We believe that the spirit of Christian brotherliness can remove every unjust barrier of trade, color, creed, and race.

5. We believe that Christian patriotism demands the practice of good will between nations.

6. We believe that international policies should secure equal justice for all races.

7. We believe that all nations should associate themselves permanently for world peace and good will.

8. We believe in international law, and in the universal use of international courts of justice and boards of arbitration.

9. We believe in a sweeping reduction of armaments by all nations.

10. We believe in a warless world, and dedicate ourselves to its achievement.

SESSION III

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD OTHER RACES OR NATIONS

A. Toward Foreigners:

A church in an industrial community agreed to take care of children during the Sunday morning service. They soon found that seventy-five per cent of those who came were the children of the foreign-born.

Some "American" parents objected strongly to having their children play with the "dagoes" and "hunkies." Finally two separate playrooms were maintained. A visitor at the rooms a few weeks later was surprised to find one equipped with the very best furniture and toys, while the other had only a sand pile. The church assistant said "the foreign kids didn't need any toys or furniture," but the visitor thought the discrimination most unfair.

B. Toward Negroes:

There are only two Negro families in a certain small New England town. One of them is rather shiftless; the other, with a splendid mother at the head of it, is thrifty and ambitious. Mrs. Kendall keeps her children neat and clean, sees that they are regular attendants at school, Sunday school and church, provides instruction in music for them, and altogether is a model mother. There is almost no race prejudice in the town; it would seem that the children could go on all through childhood without realizing the sad situation in which most Negro children have to live.

A Christmas pageant was being given in the church. The Light of the World comes to the earth for the sake of *all* the people, rich and poor, great and humble, black and yellow and brown, all the people of every land. About sixty children in appropriate costumes come to the platform as the Angel of the Light beckons to them. Two of the small Kendall children, quite naturally, were to represent the

millions of "darkest Africa." At one of the rehearsals a girl, aged twelve, who had just moved to town, said, "Yes, you *are* niggers and you've *got* to take that part!" And she turned up her nose and swaggered away.

The Kendall children went home to their mother with a new world, a tragic one, opened to them. Mrs. Kendall was quite heart-broken at the thought that the cruel, thoughtless word of a child had wrecked the beauty-world of her children. The woman in charge of the pageant agreed to leave the colored people out entirely. The little Kendalls appeared as Japanese.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Investigation

1. In what respects are the foreign-born people in your community treated differently from the native-born Americans? (Housing, schools, socially, etc.) How does your own attitude toward them compare with your attitude toward the native-born Americans?
2. Answer the same questions with regard to Negroes in your community.
3. What does "Americanization" mean in your community? Just how does it work?

Speakers

1. A foreigner may tell of the treatment received from native Americans, either socially or on the job, and the soul-reaction to it.
2. Or a colored man or woman may tell of the treatment received.

Books

Tagore, *Nationalism*

Fleming, *Marks of a World Christian*, Chapter 2

Davis, *The Russian Immigrant*, Chapter 6

Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Out of print but may be found in public libraries)

Pamphlets

Matthews and Bisseker, *Fellowship*, 10 cents. Address Kirby Page, 311 Division Ave., Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.

Information Service, Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22 St., N. Y. C. Monthly race relations numbers.

Dean Pound (with eleven prominent lawyers). *Illegal Practices of the U. S. Department of Justice.* National Popular Government League, 637 Munsey Bldg., Washington, D. C.

S. L. Gulick, *Points of Strain between Japan and the United States*, p. 79, this booklet.

G. E. Haynes, *Points of Strain between White and Negro Americans*, p. 84, this booklet.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Under what limiting conditions must the Jews in this country live (or the Japanese, the Italians or any other foreign group), such as segregation in cities, social barriers, etc.? Do you think *Case A*. cited above is unusual? Is it just or not that these conditions should be imposed? On what grounds?

2. Make a full list of limiting conditions under which Negroes must live, both in your community and through other parts of the country, such as "Jim Crow cars," limited suffrage, hotel accommodations, threat of lynching, etc. Cf. article by Mr. Haynes.

For example, a high school honor student, a Negro, was chosen last July Fourth by Mayor Curley to read the Declaration of Independence at the State House in Boston. Whereupon two former citizens wrote scurrilous letters to the mayor, saying that he had brought shame on the city.

Why do so many American white people take this attitude? Is it justified? On what grounds?

3. What are the reactions of Negroes and foreigners to these limitations imposed upon them, so far as you know?

How do you think Mrs. Kendall and the mothers of the foreign children felt?

4. What was your reaction to the attempt made by Germany to impose German culture and civilization upon the rest of Europe at the point of the bayonet? Was the German attitude justified? Was ours? Can you give examples of

the way this war-spirit expressed itself within your community?

A. What is the attitude of the people of India toward the 150 years of British rule, with what they regard as a systematic effort to impose Anglo-Saxon civilization upon them? Read (aloud in class if possible) Tagore, *Nationalism*, p. 103. Is this attitude, held by one of the greatest of modern Orientals, justified?

B. A native Indian, after a long trip in this country, writes as follows to the *Christian Century*, [May 8, 1924]: "I would tell our American missionaries in India, when they want to preach to us about brotherliness and just dealing between man and man, . . . to return to their own land and educate their own people about this idealism and brotherliness, and as to how to treat the colored people, so that real Christian fellowship might be fostered and practiced there." Do you think there is a beam to be cast out of our own eye? Cf. Matt. 7 : 1–5.

5. These are simply illustrations of a very common attitude, that of superiority, real or fancied, felt by one group of people, or one nation, toward another. Can we be friends internationally or interracially unless we are friends within our community? Is this superiority-attitude a sound basis for national life? For community life? For a peaceful world society? Why? Why not?

6. In the case of the Kendalls, given above, do you feel that the attitude of the twelve-year-old girl was Christian? Such an attitude is very common; is it right?

Compare with Paul, Acts 17 : 26.

Compare with Jesus, Matthew 23 : 11.

7. Let the class try to determine what is the Christian attitude not only toward other peoples or races across the sea — but toward our own neighbors, the people in our communities, who are different in ancestry, in beliefs or customs, — the Negroes, the Jews, the Italians or Greeks, the Japanese.

8. Do Americans really want to build a **Christian** world society? What evidence is there that we do, or do not?

9. Have *YOU* any race or religious prejudice? Do you feel you should get rid of it? How will you set about it?

SESSION IV

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM

The following advertisement was the occasion for a controversy between a professor, a minister and a business man:

"Fortune in Sugar: The price of labor in practically all the cane sugar growing countries has gone steadily up for years, except in Haiti, where the costs are lowest in the world. Haiti now is under United States control. The Haitian-American corporation owns the best sugar lands in Haiti, owns railroads, wharf, light and power plants, and is building sugar mills of the most modern design. There is assured income in the public utilities and large profits in the sugar business. We recommend the purchase of the stock of this corporation. Proceedings are being taken to list this stock on the New York Stock Exchange. Interesting story, Sugar in Haiti, mailed on request."

The professor quoted President Wilson, "States that are obliged to grant concessions are in this condition, that foreign interests are apt to dominate their domestic affairs, a condition always dangerous and apt to become intolerable." "Since," said the professor, "I do not believe in such foreign control, I would not invest in any such company. It is largely because of such investments that America now has a protectorate over Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo and Nicaragua. It is wrong." The minister nodded his head in approval. "You are right," he said, "but I would go further, I would not even invest in the government bonds of such countries, for they are safe only if our government enforces the interest payment and I do not believe in military pressure for such a purpose. Look at how close we came to war with Mexico during the Wilson administration." At this point the business man broke in with, "You are both impractical sentimentalists. Get the facts and you will find every such

investment and every such control by America has helped the foreign country itself. It is sheer nonsense to talk against foreign investments. I will invest wherever I can secure the best return for my money with safety. If the United States has to intervene in some of these little backward countries so much the better."

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation

(Have either oral reports or a speaker for not over one-third of the class hour.)

1. Define economic imperialism. (Cf. reading.)
2. Think over your friends or acquaintances. Are they connected with American investments abroad? What is your share in imperialism? How about some of the articles which you purchase?
3. Make a historical study of the acquisition of land by America from foreign countries. How far has our attitude and action been Christian?
4. Read over an account of the Mexican War in 1846 and determine the justice or injustice of the action. (Cf. Grant's *Personal Memoirs* and Rhoades' *History of the United States.*)
5. Ascertain how your local press stood on intervention in Mexico in 1913–14 and intervention in Russia in 1918–19.

Speakers

Secure an American soldier or sailor who has served in Haiti, Santo Domingo or Russia to tell you about his experiences. If there are any Filipinos, Mexicans or others belonging to countries which the United States has recently invaded or now holds, have them give their view-point.

Books

Kennedy, J. M. *Imperial America* (Out of print)

Latane, *The United States and Latin America*

Nearing, *The American Empire* (1921) pp. 202–217

Plebs, *An Outline of Modern Imperialism* (1922) pp. 111–122

Viallote, *Economic Imperialism and International Relations* (1923)

Weyl, *American World Politics* (1917) (Out of print)
Woolf, *Economic Imperialism*

Pamphlets and Articles

American Intervention in Haiti, *Annals Am. Acad.*, 100 : 109, March, 1922. (39th St. and Woodland Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.)

Should America Recognize Russia? *Annals Am. Acad.*, July, 1924.

* Nearing, *Oil and the Germs of War.*

* Page, *War*, pp. 8–10; 51–56.

The Seizure of Haiti by the United States, (Foreign Policy Assn.) National Popular Government League, 637 Munsey Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Gruening, *Conquest of Haiti and Santo Domingo*, *Current History Magazine*, 15 : 885, March, 1922.

Haiti Under American Occupation, *Century Magazine*, 103 : 836, April, 1922.

Inman, *Imperialistic America*, *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1924.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

Supposing you had been present when the matter of foreign investments was discussed, what would have been your attitude and why? Let us consider briefly the various viewpoints which might have been taken towards the problem. Which one do you agree with and why?

1. The sooner " enlightened " countries take over " the backward " the better. It helps the foreign people and gives us a chance for profitable investments.

2. Frank advocacy of foreign investment without political control but if necessary military intervention to protect them. (In case American interests are threatened by revolution as in Haiti, for instance.)

The question here arises as to just when military action is necessary and who is to determine it. Supposing an American concern is doing business in a foreign country and has itself violated the law of that country and has been unsocial in its treatment of the natives until they retaliate by damaging the property or by passing unfair laws, how far should the American government go in protecting the concern?

Supposing the American firm disclaims any wrong doing but is accused by the local government, on what evidence can the American people decide what is right? Are we likely to get that evidence through our press?

3. Approval of foreign investments with the understanding that the individual investor should take the whole risk, not calling upon the government in any way to collect interest or protect capital.

Suppose this is the attitude of one individual, would the rest of the stockholders or the officials be likely to agree when it came to the loss of some profit?

How far does the mere ownership of stock, the interest on which is being collected by military force, make one a partner to such militarism?

4. Opposition also to the purchase of the government bonds of smaller countries if it may involve us in intervention. (Millions of dollars of such bonds are sold in this country annually. What is likely to happen when one of these countries defaults in its interest payment?)

If there is time, place the arguments for and against each one of the above positions on the board and see if some general agreement can be reached, perhaps on a new alternative. The following questions may be helpful:

1. Is America Christian enough to help organize an industry abroad for the benefit of the foreign nation and not solely for profit?

2. Many Americans feel that Mexico's policy toward American business men has been unfair and wrong. Do you think, granting this to be true, that the United States should therefore step in and act as "moral guardian"? Why? Why not?

3. The public is in possession of the facts regarding the way the "oil interests" treat their fellow Americans — political corruption, price control, rifling public reserves, etc. When "oil interests" introduce such methods into Mexico, for instance, what reaction from the Mexicans should we expect? Do you think the "oil interests" should have the protection of the United States Navy? Why? Why not?

4. When we use military force because of the action of a small foreign government, are we not punishing all their people because of the guilt of only a few? Is this right?

5. Should our main purpose in foreign countries be primarily to secure economic gain or to help the people? If the latter, how much are we willing to sacrifice in monetary profit for the good of the foreign country?

6. What form of dividends should we as Christians strive

to secure from foreign investments? (Money, human happiness, Christianity or what?)

7. Is the foreign missionary enterprise an investment which differs in any fundamental way from that of a business concern? Does it have any more right to American protection?

8. Can you ascertain any principles from the teachings of Jesus which might guide us in this whole problem?

9. Since we are more "enlightened" than the "backward" and "exploited" nations, does that prove that we have a "divine mission" to rule? Who is going to decide between the rival claimants to rule? Wherein if at all does this differ from Germany's claim?

10. When we call ourselves more "enlightened" than others what do we mean? Is it true or false that our "superiority" is often confined to economic and military spheres?

SESSION V

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

In one lesson-hour it is impossible to cover adequately the facts of secret diplomacy, or the merits of such plans for international organization as the League of Nations and the World Court; the purpose of this lesson, therefore, is merely to develop a right attitude on these two important questions.

A Concrete Case. — Sir Edward Grey was British Foreign Secretary for more than ten years, beginning in 1905. He was a man of high ideals, of strict probity, with elevated concept of public duty, and one of the most influential and most peaceful diplomats in Europe. In July, 1914, when conflict seemed imminent, Sir Edward did his utmost to prevent, or at least postpone, a great European war, but —

1. He had for several years been negotiating agreements with France and Russia, known to only small groups in the countries concerned. The military and naval staffs of the three countries had also reached complete agreement as to strategy to be followed in case of war.

2. There was no international organization to which he could appeal to exert pressure on the nations for peace; he had to rely on his own influence alone.

3. There was no court to try the cases of the aggrieved nations. The Hague Tribunal could have done so on general consent, but it had no power to summon before it even the nations which had supported it.

4. War, as a method of settling international disputes, was perfectly legal; in fact, the great part of "international law" is concerned not with maintaining peace, but with regulating war.

Sir Edward, during those last fateful days, frantically called upon Germany and Austria, upon Russia and France to delay, to arbitrate, to meet for a conference, to do anything but mobilize and fight. All in vain! Try as he would, he

was powerless; circumstances were too much for him. And on August 3, 1914, Sir Edward Grey asked the British Parliament to honor the secret agreements, of which they had been completely ignorant up till that hour, and to declare war.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Books

This is the first time in history that the generation that fought a great war has had access to the secret documents leading up to it. We mention only a few of the many important studies of Europe's secret documents.

C. A. Beard, *Cross Currents in Europe Today*, Ch. 1, 2, 3, 9

P. S. Reinsch, *Secret Diplomacy*

Lord Loreburn, *How the War Came* (Out of print)

Pamphlets and Articles

* Page, *War*, pp. 20–26, 59.

Diplomacy

H. E. Barnes, *World War Guilt; Current History Magazine*, May, 1924.

L. S. Gannett, *How Poincaré Prepared for War; The Nation*, Feb. 20, 1924.

League of Nations

C. H. Levermore, *Parable of the Rich Householder;* also *The League of Nations at Four Years of Age* (See *Appendix*)

The Publications of the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, 6 East 39th St., New York City.

H. F. Ward, *The New Social Order*, Chapter 9.

World Court

The Churches of America and the World Court, from the Federal Council of Churches, 105 E. 22nd St., New York. A complete set may be had for twenty-five cents.

Shall the United States Enter the World Court? a debate, between M. O. Hudson and John Dewey, in *The Christian Century*, Oct. 11 and 18, 1923.

Publications of the Committee for the Outlawry of War, 76 W. Monroe St., Chicago, Ill. Cf. Lippmann, *Criticism of "Outlawry of War," Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1923.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Let some member of the class report on the idea and practice of secret diplomacy, and its part before and during the Great War.

2. By what right did Sir Edward Grey, foreign secretary of a democratic country, engage his government in binding alliances which he kept secret even from its Parliament? Was his course right or wrong? Why?

3. The first of President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" was the demand for "open covenants openly arrived at." Do you feel that this principle of "open diplomacy" can or should be universally applicable? Why? Principal L. P. Jacks of Oxford says the term "secret diplomacy" is tautology, there being no other kind of diplomacy. Do you think it should or must be so?

4. How much of the diplomacy of our own State Department is kept secret from us? Cite examples.

5. The covenant of the League of Nations requires that all treaties be registered at Geneva. Did the practice of secret diplomacy and the existence of secret treaties aid or hinder Sir Edward Grey in his efforts to avoid war in 1914? Would the present British Foreign Secretary stand a better chance of success in the face of a similar crisis? Why?

Former Secretary Lansing states that it was secret treaties among the Allies that all but wrecked the Peace Conference of 1919, and thoroughly poisoned the Treaty of Versailles. Should previous secret treaties have been honored? Why? Why not?

6. Let some member of the class give a five-minute report on the League of Nations, its successes and its weaknesses. List reasons for and against our becoming a member-nation in the League.

Would the United States be more willing to join the League if the obligation to use coercion against offending nations were definitely omitted? Would such an omission weaken the League? (The United States Supreme Court has never had power to enforce decisions against a sovereign state.)

7. Let another report on the World Court, our entry into which has been urged by Presidents Harding and Coolidge. List reasons for and against our joining this Court.

8. Let another report on the plan for the Outlawry of War. List reasons why the people of the United States should or should not join in this movement. Cf. C. C. Morrison, *War Is NOT a Crime*, in *Christian Century*, April 10, 1924.

For example, when the Allies wanted to punish the Kaiser for his alleged guilt in the war, they found he had committed no " crime " but had merely waged war. There was no court that could try him, and no law under which he could be tried.

9. Suppose that in 1914 a World Court with " compulsory jurisdiction " had been functioning, war had been outlawed, and the League of Nations had been working as well as at present; would Sir Edward Grey have been helped or hindered in his efforts to avoid war? In what ways?

10. The United States has, since 1919, consistently refused to share any of the attempts at world organization. By what right? Is or is not such a course in accord with American ideals of peace and international friendship? Why?

11. What can you, members of the class, do as citizens to aid in securing world-wide open diplomacy, and in furthering world-organization under law?

SESSION VI

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GREAT DESTROYER

The war cost England in round numbers 800,000 dead, 600,000 dangerously wounded, 1,400,000 less seriously wounded, 65,000 missing, 375,000 widows, 700,000 orphans. A prominent London journalist said he works each year from January 1 till June 1 for the government, and for the remaining six months of the year for his family — i. e., one half of his income is taken for taxes. A prominent international merchant, discouraged by the big total of his income tax, found that he pays sixpence out of every pound he earns, i. e., 2½ per cent of his income, into the United States treasury to help discharge the British debt. A Ford car pays $115 license fee per year to the government; one of the big London busses pays $400. The streets of London are full of beggars and peddlers, many of whom are wearing "Disabled Soldier" hat-bands, men who are the wrecks of the war as truly as those that lie under Flanders poppies, — moral wrecks, living off the public. For four years there has been a tremendous volume of unemployment, with as many as 2,000,000 out of work part of the time. The number of the slain included much of England's best manhood; no one can ever guess how much genius was there lost — such men as Rupert Brooke, the poet, Donald Hankey, author of *A Student in Arms*, and a host of others; nor can one do more than estimate what the effect will be on the next generation of having it fathered largely by the weaker, and those unfit for military service. The children of England are paying for the war! *And England won the war!*

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Investigation

1. Compare your taxes, and your cost of living, now with the figures for 1913.

2. List the young men you know who lost their lives in the war.

3. What was the "aftermath of the war" in schools and colleges, in your own community, which you could observe? (Such as hate and intolerance, rebellion against authority, immorality, lawlessness, etc.)

Books

W. Irwin, *The Next War*
W. Irwin, *Christ or Mars*, Chs. 6–9
E. L. Bogart, *Direct and Indirect Costs of War*
H. Folks, *Human Costs of the War*
G. L. Dickinson, *War, Its Nature, Cause and Cure*

Pamphlets and Articles

* K. Page, *War*, pp. 33–50.
What is War? The Christian Century, May 15, 1924.
* Eddy and Page, *The Abolition of War.*
R. Jones, *A More Excellent Way*, pp. 17–19.
F. J. Libby, *Preparedness, Locomotive Engineers' Journal*, April, 1923; also, by same author, *The Nation*, September 26, 1923.
(For such material, write to National Council for the Prevention of War, 532 17th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.)
Philip Gibbs, *The Danger of Europe if War Comes; Saturday Evening Post*, January 26, 1924.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Read aloud in class Luke 14 :.28–32.

2. HUMAN COST: *The World Tomorrow*, January, 1924, p. 5, carries the following: "Let us visualize a march of the British dead down Fifth Avenue. At daybreak they start, twenty abreast. Until sundown they march — and the next day, and the next. For ten days the British dead pass in review. For eleven days more the French dead file down the 'Avenue of the Allies.' For the Russians it would require the daylight of five more weeks. Two months and a half would be

required for the Allied dead to pass a given point. The enemy dead would require more than six weeks more. . . ."

Let the class list some of the possible "great men" included in that terrible march, great men lost to the world.

3. Material Cost: Dr. H. E. Fosdick, preacher in New York City, said in his Armistice Day sermon, 1923:

"In this last war we spent on the average $215,000,000 a day or $9,000,000 an hour. . . . Consider all the money all the churches of America raised last year for all their Christian work at home or abroad! Every three days during the war we burned up more than that. Such is modern war, and it is utterly suicidal."

Let the class list some things that might be done with $9,000,000, not per hour, but per month or per year.

4. Moral Cost: Will Irwin writes, *Christ or Mars*, p. 108:

"Let us try to strike the moral balance. For war, its voluntary sacrifices; against war, its hates, now perpetuated to last through decades and even centuries of peace, its ethical confusion which results in the atrophy of common honesties, decencies and purities; and finally its subtle corruption of a whole rising generation. Where, now, stands the balance?"

In December, 1917, Franklin K. Lane, then Secretary of the Interior, refused to give an interview on the moral benefits of the War, saying, "This is sheer camouflage. . . . The war will degrade us. That is the plain fact . . . make sheer brutes of us. . . . You must go elsewhere for your uplift stuff." Was he right or wrong?

List points at which war, in the nature of it, brings moral looseness and deterioration. Do you think the orgy of graft and corruption in Washington (similar to that which followed the Civil War) can be charged up as a "cost of the war"? Do you think a young man is better or worse as the result of two years in active war service? Why? List on a blackboard if possible, gains (moral and material) and losses of the war to America.

5. The Next War: Let some member of the class make a report on the kind of thing the next war will be, in the judgment of some competent observers. Cf. K. Page, *War*, p. 71 ff; W. Irwin, *The Next War*, etc.

6. Let some member of the class look up and report on

the war expenditures in the United States during these "piping times of peace," giving the larger items. 92% of the national expenditures in 1920, and 85% in 1922, were for war purposes. Our government is now spending over half a billion dollars a year on preparations for war. Cf. K. Page, *War*, p. 57 ff., also Libby, *Preparedness*. Note also, in the papers, the constant agitation for summer military training camps, enlarged appropriations for army and navy.

Many believe these large expenditures necessary for police protection. Do you think so? Cf. p. 77.

7. Do you believe preparedness is the way to get rid of war? Is all this wise? Necessary?

Why should not the government maintain a Peace Department, and appropriate annually the cost of a battleship or two for building world friendship? I.e., would you agree that all nations could and should spend for peace a large share of what they now spend for war?

8. Although the huge armies of Germany and Austria are disbanded, there are, in 1924, almost 2,000,000 more men under arms in Europe, on a peace basis, than there were in June, 1914. The army budgets of France, Italy, Poland, Russia, Czecho-Slovakia and Jugo-Slavia, etc., are huge. Aeroplanes, poison-gas, high-explosives, greater guns and bombs than ever, are in readiness. (Even the United States in spite of the discussions of the Washington conference has a poison-gas factory in New Jersey.) Express your judgment about all this! Is it necessary? What can be done about it?

9. We know now something about the human cost, the material cost, the moral and religious cost of the last war. What, in your judgment, is the rational attitude to take toward "war, the great destroyer"? What is your attitude toward it, as an individual? How will you express that attitude in action?

What can you do to destroy "war, the great destroyer"?

SESSION VII

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

A Concrete Case in War Time. — Roger Baldwin is a social worker of national reputation. When America entered the war he deliberately refused to serve in the army. As he said, " The compelling motive for refusing to comply with the draft act is my uncompromising opposition to the principle of conscription of life by the state for any purpose whatsoever, in time of war or peace. . . . I am the more opposed to the present act, because it is for the purpose of conducting war. I do not believe in the use of physical force as a method of achieving any end, however good. . . . I know that as far as my principles are concerned, they seem to be utterly impractical . . . but I firmly believe that they are the views which are going to guide in the future." The United States judge imposed the maximum prison sentence on Mr. Baldwin, saying, among other things, " It may often be that a man or woman has greater foresight than the masses of the people. And it may be that in the history of things, he who seems to be wrong today may be right tomorrow. But with these possible idealistic and academic speculations a court has nothing to do."

A Concrete Case in Peace Time. — The experience of Gordon H. Ward at the Massachusetts School of Agriculture: " Upon returning to college this fall, I asked to be excused from military training on the ground that I am conscientiously opposed to war and preparation for war. I expressed my position in this way. I am an avowed Christian. By acknowledging Christ as my Saviour, I have pledged myself to live according to the principles which he set forth in his teachings as I understand them. I believe that the whole tone of his teachings is one of peace, service, and brotherhood. My conscience requires me to live according to these principles. War and preparation for war are directly opposed to these teachings; therefore I am utterly opposed to war and prep-

aration for war. The authorities granted my application and I was excused."

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation. (One or more of the topics below to be assigned to each member of the class. All the class should read the sermon by Tittle, the article by Thomas and the review by Boisen in the *Appendix*.)

1. Search the Old and New Testaments for those who were persecuted for refusal to conform to the standards of their time. What do you think was Jesus' position on the subject of war?

2. Do you know any one who was a conscientious objector during the war? What attitude did you then take toward him? Has your attitude changed? If so, why? If not, why?

3. Make a careful study and be ready to report on the motives which dominated the socialist, the individualist, the humanitarian, and the religious objectors during the war, and the way in which they were treated. (See *Non-Violent Coercion*, pp. 118–147 and 251–285; also *The Conscientious Objector in America*.)

4. Make a study of the life of Gandhi in India or of the principles of Tolstoy. (Read *Young India*, Huebsch Co., and *Mahatma Gandhi*, by Rolland, Century Co.)

5. Interview a leading editor, lawyer, business man, or minister and find out his attitude towards a man who refused to serve in the World War.

6. The book *The Conscientious Objector in America* is so important that at least one member of the class should read it.

Speakers

Secure a conscientious objector who has been in prison for his convictions during the war to tell you of his experiences, or secure a speaker from the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 396 Broadway, New York, to tell you about the peace-time movement against war.

Books

Case, *Non-Violent Coercion*
Munro, *The Early Christian Persecutions*

Thomas, *The Conscientious Objector in America*
Trachtenburg, *The American Socialists and the War*

Pamphlets or Articles

* Eddy and Page, *The Abolition of War*, pp. 85–92.
W. E. Mason, *Conscientious Objectors* (United States Government Printing).
* Roger Baldwin, *The Individual and the State.*
The United States versus Pringle; Atlantic Monthly, Vol. III, p. 145.
The Test of Faith; Atlantic Monthly, May, 1923.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

There are two issues in this lesson which every individual should clearly face and settle for himself. (1) What should be my attitude towards war and war machinery? (2) How far has the state a right to compel me to do an act which I believe is wrong?

Place the arguments for and against the conscientious objector in war time and in peace on the blackboard. The following questions may be useful:

1. Supposing you had been a follower of Christ in the time of Nero and were given the choice of worshipping the emperor or being tortured to death, what would have been your decision? Why?

2. Americans believe Germany was wrong in the World War. Had you been living in Germany as a citizen and believed their cause wrong, ought you to have refused to fight? Why or why not?

3. Do you or do you not believe in the words of Jesus, "Love your enemies"? Why? What does the principle involve, if carried out in war time? In peace time?

4. To whom does the citizen owe supreme moral allegiance, the state or his own interpretation of a higher loyalty?

5. Is it right for the citizen to obey a bad law? Why or why not? Was Wendell Phillips right or wrong in helping to violate the Fugitive Slave Law? In Japan in 1860 it was against the law to become a Christian. Should missionaries help others to violate this law?

6. List in the order of their value, in your opinion, the following qualities, giving your reasons: (If you consider

several to be of the same value, note that fact also.) (a) Loyalty to God, (b) Loyalty to our ideals, (c) Loyalty to the state, (d) Conformity to established customs and traditions, (e) The Jesus Way of Life or unselfish friendly service for others, (f) Conformity to the law in regard to military service.

Test the action of conscientious objectors by your grading in the above.

7. What should be our attitude towards those who sincerely differ from us? How should we treat a conscientious objector during war and in peace? Was the treatment accorded the conscientious objector during the war by our government entirely right? If so, why? If not, what changes would you make and why?

8. The conscientious objector believes there is a "better way" than war. He feels not only that his conscience is offended by war, but also that his intelligence is insulted. State clearly why you believe this attitude right or wrong.

9. The conscientious objector in war and in peace is doing what he believes to be right even at severe personal cost. How much are we willing to suffer to help banish war? What concrete things are we willing to do? What positive things can we do to foster peace?

SESSION VIII

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE "NEWS" IN PEACE AND WAR

How can we distinguish the truth from propaganda?

In War Time. "It is, of course, true, as most well-informed people now understand, that the Rathom disclosures which made *The Providence Journal* famous during the war were fiction — but Rathom did all this for the praiseworthy purpose of arousing his countrymen to a war fury. He took one of the practical ways of doing so. When pressed by the Department of Justice with the realities in the matter, he blandly asked if the Germans were not doing things similar to those which he had pictured. And on getting an affirmative reply, he answered: "What was the harm then in giving the people an equivalent to the reality?" His idea was that fiction cognate to the facts would serve an entirely justifiable purpose. . . . This is all a part of the war game and will be as long as war lasts as a means of settling disputes. . . . Mr. Rathom, an intrepid journalist of originality and force, merely 'played the game.'" — *From an editorial in The Boston Herald*, December 30, 1923.

In Peace Time. In order to discredit the Bolsheviks, a prominent American professor not long ago decided to send out "the nationalization of women story" to every fraternal club in America. He was told by a reliable informant that "the story was a fabrication and had been totally disproved in Russia, that William Allen White has declared that no one now pretends there is any basis of truth in the story whatever, and that the American government has officially denied it."

"Oh, well," the professor replied, "the story is bad, and the Bolsheviks are bad, so it can't do any harm. We'll just send it out anyway." The professor has since been appointed to a responsible diplomatic post in our foreign service.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Have either oral reports or a speaker for not over one-third of the class period.)

Investigation (All the class should read *The Growth of a Press Legend*, p. 78 in the *Appendix* of this pamphlet.)

1. Enumerate the number of speakers that have come to your community in the past six months to speak on some aspect of international affairs. What has been their purpose? Could you detect any propaganda? How much and by whom were they paid? To what extent does the community desire to know the truth?

2. Ascertain any other sources for honest information about Europe which your community has.

3. List the various articles and books on international affairs which you can remember reading. Make a serious attempt to find out the background and the bias of each of these writers.

4. Have one member of the class study carefully and report on the propaganda methods used during the war.

5. Have another member of the class make a five-minute report on the pamphlet *The Power of the Press for Peace and War* (in LIBRARY PACKAGE).

Speakers

Secure a speaker who can explain exactly how international news is gathered and presented through the press. Note how many minds pass on and elaborate an international news item before you read it. (The person or source from which the news is originally secured, the correspondent, the Associated Press agent, the newspaper editor, etc.)

Books

Ross, *The Russian Soviet Republic* (Ch. 23, "The Poison-Gas Attack")

Gibbs, *Now It can be Told*

Campbell Stuart, *Secrets of Crewe House* (Out of print)

Creel, *How We Advertised America* (Out of print)

Beard, *Cross Currents in Europe Today* (Ch. 1)

Pamphlets or Articles

* Jerome Davis, *Christianity and International Relations*, also *The Adulteration and Poisoning of the News* (10 cents). Address the author, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Rear Admiral Sims, *Current History Magazine*, June, 1923.

Harry E. Barnes, *American Mercury*, January, 1924.

Walter Lippmann, *Liberty and the News*, Harcourt Brace & Co., New York City.

Lippman & Merz, *New Republic Supplement*, Aug. 4, 1920. ("Test of the News.")

Norman Angell, *The Press and the Organization of Society*, Labour Publishing Co., London, England.

* *The Power of the Press for Peace and War*, National Council for Prevention of War. *Very important.*

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

We face here a very difficult problem of moral responsibility. There may be in this class members who take each of the following attitudes:

A. *In the problem of war time "news" —*

1. "Any falsehood is justified in war."

George Creel tells us of the stupendous propaganda carried on by our government during the war. There was "no medium of appeal" that was not employed. Seventy-five million books and pamphlets were circulated. Four-minute speeches were delivered to 300,000,000 people, *et cetera.*

Capt. Ferdinand Tuohy of the British Secret Service tells us of European propaganda in "The Secret Corps." "All the trickery and subterfuge and war-wisdom of the ages brought up-to-date, intensified and harnessed to every modern invention and device, . . . a Machiavelli, a Talleyrand or some other master schemer of the ages, come back to earth, would have thrilled at the amazing cunning and corruption of it all."

2. "There are illegitimate falsehoods in war time, but 'hate stories' may be manufactured, provided the enemy really does similar things which are bad."

(This seems to have been the attitude of the *Boston Herald.*)

3. "The broadcasting of real falsehoods in war time is wrong, but it is perfectly proper for governmental authorities to create and foster *through inference* certain false impressions in the public mind."

4. "No falsehood is justified."

B. *In the problem of peace time "news" —*

1. "Any falsehood is justified provided it is necessary to achieve 'good ends' such as passing a law restricting immigration; or it may be necessary when diplomatic relations are strained."

This seems to have been the view-point of some people about news of Russia. Dr. E. A. Ross of Wisconsin University dedicates his book, "The Russian Soviet Republic," "To My Fellow Americans who have become weary of being fed lies and propaganda about Russia." He there says, "The freshet of lies began in the summer of 1917, when Bolshevism

lifted its head on the horizon, rose rapidly after the Brest Litovsk peace, fairly rioted after the Armistice when the emigrés saw no hope of getting back to their estates save with the aid of foreign bayonets . . . "

2. " No deception of the public is ever justified."

Place on the blackboard the arguments for and against these different attitudes centering attention on the ones championed by members of the class. See if a common conclusion cannot be reached, to which all will substantially agree. Justify or condemn the position of the *Boston Herald* and of the American professor in the two cases given.

What methods can you suggest to help us break through the propaganda barriers?

1. Could each member of this class study one country thoroughly and be responsible for reports on it?

2. Could we all endeavor to read both sides of important controversies?

3. Could we consistently read several reliable journals about foreign affairs such as:

The Living Age;

The Nation (International Relations Section);

Manchester Guardian Weekly (220 West 42nd St., N.Y.C.);

The New Leader (2 Carmelite St., London, England);

Our World (9 East 37th St., New York);

Foreign Affairs (25 West 23d St., New York);

4. Can we insist that our religious and secular press print both sides?

In an address in Chicago in February, 1924, President Hopkins of Dartmouth College said, " A friend of mine wrote to me some months ago that he would as soon have Lenine or Trotsky speak at Dartmouth as some of the speakers whom we were having there. I replied that if those responsible for a theory of government which now dominates an eighth of the earth's surface and a great host of her people were available for the explanation of their theories to the undergraduate body I should be glad to have the students hear them and to have them form their judgment as to the dangers or merits of Bolshevism on the basis of direct evidence, rather than through the inconsistent and contradictory pronouncements of anti-Bolshevist propaganda."

Why have almost none of our periodicals been willing to print authoritative articles by Bolshevik governmental leaders?

SESSION IX

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD ENEMIES

"Yes, I'd wipe all sixty millions of them off the face of the earth if I could." Mrs. Johnson is a highly educated and cultured woman, the wife of a professor in a prominent eastern college. She has read and traveled a great deal. She is a devoted mother, a self-sacrificing friend, kindly and generous to a fault. And for twenty-five years prior to 1914 she was devoted to Germany, to the German people, their music and literature and art. Her husband had studied in Germany for several years, and she had visited the country with him.

And yet in January, 1924, she said, "I'd wipe all sixty millions of the German nation off the face of the earth if I could. They've deserved no better fate! They are devils, they have brought misery to millions of us, they have plunged the world into tragedy, they behaved like beasts of the jungle for those four years of the war, and they prepared for such actions for forty years before that. They are unspeakable! They don't belong in the human family at all! The whole world would be infinitely better off if every German were annihilated."

And then, a little later, she added: "You see, my boy was in France for two years. He does not feel as I do about the Germans. But a mother's heart cannot forget. . . . No, I'll admit it, I am not a very good Christian."

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(Not more than one-third of the class hour should be devoted to this section.)

Investigation

1. Examine carefully your own present attitude toward the late enemies of our country. Why do you hold it?
2. What friends and acquaintances have you of German origin? What is your attitude toward them?

3. Make a list of the different attitudes of your friends and acquaintances toward Germany. What causes the differences in feeling?

Speakers

The class might secure a German-American, or a traveler who has lived in Germany for a time, who can explain impartially the differences between Germany and the United States, and the causes of the spirit of Germany in the last fifteen years.

Books

Irwin, *Christ or Mars*, Chapters 4 and 5
Gibbs, *Now It Can Be Told*
Russell, *Why Men Fight*
Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*

Pamphlets and Articles

Barnes, *World War Guilt, Current History Magazine*, May 1924.
Thomas, *Fear as the Foe of Peace*, cf. p. 89 of this booklet.
* Page, *War*, pp. 26, 42, 47, 69.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. How many members of the class have German blood in them? Do you consider it an asset or a liability?

2. Mrs. Johnson wants all the Germans blotted out. What do we owe to Germany and the Germans, as for example the poetry of Goethe, the music of Wagner, the philosophy of Kant? Let the class make as complete a list of such valuable things as possible. Is there any reason to believe that there will not be more of such precious gifts from the same source to our common life and civilization? What?

3. Mrs. Johnson is by nature kindly, gentle, loving, and most of her life she was particularly friendly to the Germans. What is responsible for the profound and abiding change of attitude on her part? (Refer to Session VIII, to Irwin, and to K. Page.)

4. What are the effects of a spirit of hatred, like that of Mrs. Johnson?

A. *During war time.* Can a nation wage war without it? Can men kill or sanction the killing of enemies unless they hate? Let members of the class describe quite frankly their own attitudes toward the Germans during the war, and account for them so far as possible. Do you agree with the war premier who said: "Let us learn to hate the Germans! That is the one essential! If we have that, then munitions, ships, soldiers, money, all will come!"

B. *After the war is over:* Can the hate spirit be changed at once? (Mrs. Johnson's conversation was over five years after the Armistice.) Against what sort of people was the hate spirit directed in this country during 1919? Is the usual American attitude of distrust and contempt for England due, in your opinion, to the prevalent teaching about the Revolutionary War in our schools?

C. *In the period of reconstruction:* What effect did the war-time hate between the North and the South after our Civil War have upon the speed of reconstruction? Can the attitude of Mrs. Johnson be a solid foundation on which to build a peaceful World Society? Why, or why not?

5. After a war, should the policies of the victor nations be revengeful or reconciling? Give examples of each type of policy on the part of the Allies. Clemenceau said that the peace treaty was merely a means of continuing the war against Germany. Should it have been so? Or should healing the wounds and rebuilding the shattered world come foremost?

6. Mrs. Johnson herself said, "I am not a very good Christian." Do you agree with her? Is the "Christian" attitude toward enemies possible, or desirable? Read aloud in class Matthew 5 : 38–48. Is the Christian under obligation to "love his enemies"? What does that command mean?

7. In this lesson we discuss the attitude toward the Germans simply because it is a concrete case, widely familiar. The real question at issue is, What shall be our attitude toward any individual or group of people on the other side of an issue — race rivalry, for instance; or industrial conflict, such as a strike; or a quarrel within a church?

SESSION X

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NEED OF EUROPE

Mr. Knox, a prominent business man, a life-long church member, a leader in various kinds of religious and philanthropic work throughout his own state, was present at the board meeting of his church when the question was raised of participating in a drive to help German women and children. Some of the facts about German conditions from the report of Dr. Haven Emerson of Columbia University to the American Friends Service Committee, were given:

"Few if any children over four have had milk in the cities since 1914, unless they were sick in the hospital. . . . One in ten of the babies born alive in Berlin is given over to an institution to raise because of poverty of the family. . . . Three children in a bed and five or six persons in a bedroom are common in city and country."

As the American business man listened, he leaned forward and his eyes began to flash. Finally at the close he brought his clenched fist down on the table saying in a dramatic and earnest manner, "You gentlemen know I have always given to good causes and believe in Christian charity, but not one cent will I give to this work. Those Germans are the greatest criminals in the world's history! They are getting only what they deserve! It is the just punishment of a righteous God! Let them suffer!"

One of the other members of the church board replied as tactfully as he could, "Surely, Mr. Knox, you can't really mean that. Suppose some of these children were right here in the room. They had nothing to do with the war." But Mr. Knox shook his head and refused to sanction the appeal. "We can use the money better on deserving Americans," was his final comment as he voted against the movement.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation

A speaker or oral reports may be used for not over one-third of the class hour. Ascertain the extent of the dependence of your community on our world society.

1. List the articles used by your family which come from abroad.
2. Have you any foreign-born ancestors, relations, or friends? How does this affect your attitude?
3. Make a list of the foreign-born who come in contact with your home or business each week. How many of the American manufactured articles in your home are the product of the toil of foreign-born workers in America?
4. Study the life of Jesus to determine what his attitude would be on help for Europe. (Especially Lk. 10 : 29–37.)

Speakers

Secure a speaker who has been in Europe to describe the life of the common people (not the hotel or tourist life) in Germany, Austria, Poland, Russia, or Turkey; or secure someone who is appealing for money to be used abroad.

Books

Ravage, *The Malady of Europe* (Introduction)
Nitti, *The Decadence of Europe* (Preface)
Guest, *The Struggle for Power in Europe* (Out of print)

Pamphlets or Articles

The Facts, (Can be secured in quantity.) The American Committee for Relief of German Children, Suite 2202, 130 West 42d Street, New York City.

Sherwood Eddy, *Russia.* American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Write to the Foreign Mission Board of your denomination asking for their pamphlets on " Why give to foreign causes? " or similar appeals.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

If you had been on the board of trustees with Mr. Knox, how would you have voted and why? On such a complicated question, there are wide differences of honest opinion. The

following four view-points have actually been taken by different members of various church committees.

1. America needs all the money we can give. Europe can take care of herself. She herself is to blame anyway.

2. We have a responsibility abroad but not to guilty countries whom we have had to fight. God is punishing them. (This seems to have been essentially the point of view of Mr. Knox.)

3. We have a responsibility to aid the children of enemy countries but not the adults who started the war.

4. We have a responsibility both to understand the conditions and to aid all the peoples in European countries as long as they are in dire need, regardless of their guilt.

A. Which of these solutions is the nearest right from your view-point and why? Do you have any other alternatives to suggest? Which attitude do you think Christ would have taken? Do you think all the people in a nation can ever be morally responsible for war? Is it ever right to withhold help from suffering children?

B. Have you ever felt " righteous " indignation towards a foreign people? Was it self-righteous? Consider the parable of the mote and the beam. Matt. 7 : 3–5.

C. Were or were not the majority of the German people unconscious victims of their environment? Does your answer affect the question of giving them aid?

D. Is money the only kind of help we should give?

Ray Stannard Baker in *Current History* for January, 1924, charges that while we contribute in " spare change " philanthropy to help Europe, we refuse to help in genuine reconstruction. We preach to bankrupt Europe and at the same time demand that she pay us the last penny of the $11,000,000,000 she owes us, although we erect tariffs to prevent her doing so.

What other methods of service to Europe that Americans might render would you suggest?

E. Referring to Luke 10, the story of the Good Samaritan: Who is *your* neighbor? What is your obligation to your neighbor? Who is *not* your neighbor?

F. What can we do towards creating international good will in our home community? How about the immigrants within our gates? Should helping the immigrant take precedence over aid sent to Europe?

G. Have you and has your community done too much or too little in international giving? What changes would you make for another year? What can this class do about it?

H. How far are you responsible for America's foreign policy?

SESSION XI

SHALL THE CHURCH SUPPORT WAR?

TWO CONCRETE CASES

1. The minister of a church in Long Island, going to a religious conference, asked his Sunday-school superintendent, Sergeant Reid, a hero of the World War, to preach in his place. During the week the sergeant read the newspaper accounts of the conference sessions, read how the bishop had scolded his ministers for introducing an anti-war resolution, how he longed to do his religious bit in khaki again. This was enough for Sergeant Reid; he decided to preach on war. According to the newspaper this is what he said:

"Last week one of our leaders lauded the spiritual exaltation gained by our young men in the recent war, and decried an effort to have the church take a stand against future bloodshed. Perhaps there is some excuse for such talk from a man who spent his period of service in France lecturing and preaching to the boys and visiting them in hospitals — all well behind the danger zone. But I have never heard any of the boys who lay on hospital cots, or who lost their legs, or who cursed the Huns and the mud in the front line trenches, speak of the spiritual exaltation of their experience. I am afraid that any clergyman who sees spiritual value in a struggle that costs 26,000,000 lives and leaves the world asking if there is anything good in this so-called Christian civilization, needs to reread Christ's words in the New Testament. If the church does not teach the nations that war is always wrong, that it is never and can never be Christ's way of settling disputes between groups of men, who can or will teach them? It seems to me that this is one of the great tasks and duties and opportunities of the Christian churches today, to outlaw war."

2. Because he opposed war and believed it contrary to the spirit of Christ, a minister in a western state decided to see if he could free his church forever from any sort of

bondage to Mars or the war spirit. He proposed to his congregation that never again should the church platform or its buildings be used in support of war. This aroused great discussion and some opposition but the minister was upheld by a rising vote of his congregation.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation

1. What is the attitude of the churches in your community toward war now? How many "peace" sermons have been preached? What are the Sunday schools and the young people's societies of your denomination doing to educate their membership about war or to build international friendship?

2. Make a careful study of the teachings of Jesus to determine whether he would favor church activity in support of war?

3. Ask at least two ministers what would be their attitude towards passing a resolution never again to use the church in support of war. List their arguments pro and con for use in the class discussion.

4. Members of the class should be assigned to make reports —

A. On *Peace Resolutions of the Churches* printed in the *Appendix.*

B. On *Patriotism and Pacifism* in the *Century Magazine*, July, 1924.

C. On *Loyalty to Christ in Time of War*, printed in the *Appendix.*

Speakers

Ask one of your local ministers to tell you briefly what he thinks the churches of your community can do to educate against war and in favor of international friendship, or if there is some veteran of the World War ask him to tell you what the churches might do.

Books

Barbusse, *Under Fire*
Dawson, *Diary of a Dead Soldier*
Gibbs, *Now It Can Be Told*
Gulick, *Christian Crusade for a Warless World*

Irwin, *Christ or Mars?*
Page, *The Sword or the Cross*
War

Pamphlets

* Eddy and Page, *The Abolition of War*, pp. 75–85.

Editorials and articles in *The Christian Century* on war during February, March, April and May, 1924, especially those in the issues of Feb. 7, 14, March 6, 22 and April 24, and an article by Will Irwin in issue of March 16.

Glenn Frank, *Patriotism and Pacifism; Century Magazine*, July, 1924.

See *Peace Resolutions of the Churches*, printed in *Appendix*, p. 102; also *Loyalty to Christ in Time of War*, and *Church, State and War.*

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

Supposing this class had the power to decide the attitude of a particular church towards war, what would be the various positions which you might take?

1. Do you think the church should support and bless our government and its armies in every war? Why?

2. Do you believe the church should reserve the right to support every righteous war and to condemn every unjust one even if our country were involved? Why?

3. Would you agree with those who say the church should agree never again to use any part of her organization in support of war? Why? This might be termed "excommunicating" war. It would still leave the individual free to do as his conscience dictates.

Is there any wiser, more Christian course for the church to take?

If there is time, list on the board the arguments for and against these positions. Do you think some other action still better than those mentioned?

1. Should the church assume outstanding leadership in the problem of preventing war? Why or why not?

2. Should the church lead or follow the state in moral leadership? Why?

3. If the church cannot evolve moral and spiritual authority for the task of fighting war, what other agency is

likely to do it? Would this mean the other agency was more Christian than the church or not? Why?

4. General Bliss of the United States Army believes that whenever the churches of America become really concerned about the problem of war and take action, we shall achieve lasting peace. He says, "The responsibility is entirely on the professing Christians of the United States. If another war like the last one should come, they will be responsible for every drop of blood that will be shed." Do you agree or disagree? Why?

5. Prof. Harry F. Ward of Union Theological Seminary declares that the church has always sanctioned every war and still gives its sanction, that this is morally wrong, that the church must now recognize war as an evil and have nothing more to do with it. State why you agree or disagree with this.

6. Were the churches of our enemies right in using their religious agencies and buildings in support of war? Were they then "partners in the war business"? Did they "fling over war the cloak which religion wears"? What do you feel should be the position of American churches in the event of another war?

7. Assuming that you believe that the church should take some action on war, what are you yourself willing to do to see to it that the church fulfills her duty in this regard?

SESSION XII

HOW CAN THE CHURCH SUPPORT WORLD FELLOWSHIP?

A Concrete Case. Early in 1918 when the World War was at its height, three bishops of Denmark, Sweden and Norway signed a call to an International Christian Conference. The Pope, other prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, and representatives of twenty-five Protestant communions, were invited to come from the principal belligerent and neutral countries. The invitation said, "We emphasize the strictly religious and unpolitical character of the conference. The task of this Christian Conference is, without any prejudice to national loyalty, that of manifesting the spiritual unity in Christ of all believers, and to weigh in prayer the duty of the Church to resist the passions of war and to promote that temper which makes for justice and good will in the intercourse of nations."

In Great Britain the Council to Promote an International Christian Meeting urged acceptance of the Scandinavian bishops' invitation saying, "There is a great work to be done in prayer. . . . Without attempting to interfere in political action, it is imperatively needed to create the atmosphere in which the diplomatists of good will can arrange righteous terms of peace."

In the United States, The Federal Council of Churches reported, "It was agreed that it was not advisable for the Federal Council to take definite action on the matter at this time." It took no effective action later. The proposed conference was never held.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation

1. Ask ministers, foreign missionaries, Quakers, members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, returned soldiers, and Christian laymen what they think are the most important things for the church to do in support of world fellowship.

2. Find out from some people who don't go to church, whose opinion you respect, their reasons for not supporting church work. Ask some wage earner if possible.

3. Have different members of the class make a report on the various activities carried on during and after the war to promote world friendship by each of the organizations listed below.

4. Write out, in less than 100 words, your own conception of the main duty of the Christian church.

5. Have some member of the class make a brief report on the scope of the foreign work of your denomination.

Speakers

Secure a speaker from one of the following organizations who can tell what was done by the religious forces for international good will during and after the war.

American Friends Service Committee, 20 S. Twelfth St., Philadelphia, Pa.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation, 396 Broadway, New York.

The Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22nd St., New York.

The Christian Endeavor, Christian Endeavor Building, Boston, Mass.

International Committee of the Y. M. C. A. or Y. W. C. A., New York City.

The Near East Relief, 149 5th Ave., New York.

World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, 70 5th Ave., New York City.

See complete list in *Appendix*, p. 112.

Books

H. T. Hodgkin, *The Christian Revolution*

W. E. Orchard, *The Outlook for Religion* (Out of print)

Rufus Jones, *A Service of Love in War Time*

Simkovitch, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*

Pamphlets or Articles

Fellowship of Reconciliation, *Statement of Principles;*

* *War Is Un-Christian, But;*

International Problems and the Christian Way of Life, published by *The Inquiry*, 129 East 52nd St., New York City.

The World Tomorrow, Volume for 1918 and issues for March and August, 1923.

Also write to any of the organizations listed for pamphlets telling of their work during and after the war.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. In the case for today what reasons might have led the British and American groups to accept or fear to accept the invitation? Might these have been among them: differing beliefs in the value of united prayer, refusals of governments to grant passports, fear that it might help a German "peace drive," practicability?

2. Knowing what you do of war-time propaganda and the secret aims of governments, and considering the insecurity and bitterness of the present peace, which attitude toward the conference do you think was better? Give reasons. What do you think it might have accomplished?

3. Lowes Dickinson says, "The teaching of mankind is now done not by any church; it is done by a small set of newspaper proprietors who have no object except to make money."

Yet no institution except the church pretends to speak for God. What concretely do you think the church should do in peace and in war? Give your reasons. For instance, should the churches in Germany have protested against the invasion of Belgium? Should the churches in England and America have protested against the blockade which we enforced for several months after the armistice, which killed daily about eight hundred German men, women and children? This was three times the number of *Lusitania* victims per week. Should our churches have objected during the war, or after the war, or not at all?

4. Does the following correctly describe a true church?

"A great international society of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, a reconciling agency breaking down 'the middle wall of partition,' striving to make actual in the midst of a pagan world its great ideal of all mankind living as one family under the universal fatherhood of God."

Might such a church solve some of the problems you have studied in this course? Does foreign missionary work fulfil the ideal given here? How about the methods of your local church?

5. Jesus said, "If any one wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and so follow me." The cross for him was the Roman gallows. Might the church in the modern world be called to follow Jesus quite literally, if it stood out against war, for instance? Or industrial exploitation? Or if it did not depend on armed backing in the mission field? Would the church be really Christian if in order to escape this ordeal, or be practical, it toned down its righteousness? Which way would the church be most effective?

6. Now consider again the case at the beginning of the lesson. What do you think the British and American churches should have done? What can *this class* do to influence your church now to take the best action for world fellowship?

SESSION XIII

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

A Concrete Case. George Smith having discussed international problems for twelve weeks in a class, had become vitally interested in the colossal problems confronting Japan, Russia, Great Britain, France and Germany. He had been stirred up over propaganda, discouraged by economic imperialism, and fired by the prospects of building "a warless world." But as he sat thinking it all over he couldn't for the life of him see practically what he was going to do about it. The problems were all much too tremendous, and he was only one individual remote from anything even faintly approaching an international issue. He finally resolved to take a bit more interest in foreign affairs but did nothing else. . . .

Every other case in this series has been true and this is real, too, in so far as it represents the problem each one of us here is facing. The concrete case today is the most vital and interesting of the whole course; it is that of this class itself, the attitudes of its members, the action that they will not only resolve to take now, but what each individually and collectively will actually DO about it, this year and in the future. How are we ever really going to translate our interest, our beliefs, and our enthusiasms into some concrete and worthwhile action?

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Investigation

1. Read over the parables of Jesus to discover whether he laid major stress on good intentions or on concrete doing. (Cf. Matt. 25; Lk. 10 : 25–37; 18 : 18–30.) Prepare a three-minute paper on what you think Jesus would do if he lived in your home town, to build world friendship.

2. Find out what the various churches in your community are doing and have done in this regard: sermons, the

Sunday school, international gifts, resolutions, outside lectures, and other ways.

3. Interview one or two of the leading editors, lawyers, business men or ministers in your town asking them what they can suggest for you and for the class to do. (Incidentally, this may help some of the individuals you interview to face the question for themselves.)

4. Make a study of what the Quakers have done during the war and in peace time for foreign countries.

Books

S. Eddy, *Facing the Crisis*

S. L. Gulick, *Christian Crusade for a Warless World*

H. Hodgkin, *Christian Revolution*

W. P. Merrill, *Christian Internationalism* (Out of print)

E. Picton-Turberville, *Christ and International Life* (Out of print)

J. L. Lobingier, *World Friendship Through the Church School*

Pamphlets

International Problems and the Christian Way of Life. (See Session XII.)

Various pamphlets in the *Christianity and World Problems Series*, including Page on **War*. 311 Division Ave., Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.

What the Pastor can do in the Crusade for a Warless World, Federal Council of Churches.

THINKING THROUGH THE PROBLEM

1. Twelve times we have met to discuss twelve fundamental issues in international fellowship. Recall each lesson topic; while there is no time now to discuss them all, there may be one or two about which the majority of the group feel they need more light. If so, spend additional time on that problem.

2. Does or does not the average citizen have reasoned convictions and a Christian conscience on the following matters? Why? (a) His duty to contribute to worthy projects for foreign and enemy countries (missions, relief, etc.); (b) Equality for other races; (c) Economic imperialism; (d) War; (e) The conscientious objector; (f) Should the church support war? (g) The League of Nations; (h) The World Court;

(i) The Outlawry of War. What are your convictions on these matters now in the light of this course?

3. Should we, or should we not, make our convictions on such matters known in the following every-day situations: (a) the home; (b) the school; (c) the business world; (d) the community life; (i. e. church, lodge, or society)?

If you believe we should keep silent in any of the above situations, make clear just how and when you believe one's convictions should be expressed. If you believe we should not keep silent in any of the above situations, state clearly *what* one ought to do and say in each case. Is there any principle which might guide us?

4. Is there anything else that we as individuals might do to promote and share our international ideals? (For instance, help circulate literature, organize study groups and promote wise political action.)

5. How can the class collectively share in building a world of friendship? Consider each of the following programs and determine whether it would be wise or unwise for your class or church or community to support them.

(a) A monthly discussional luncheon on international topics with speakers from both sides. (This has been done by The Foreign Policy Association, 3 West 29th St., New York City.)

(b) Occasional mass meetings — forums — in the evening on the most important foreign question of the moment with speakers from both sides.

(c) An investigation into just what your public schools are doing to educate for peace. In one community they started an occasional assembly meeting on international affairs in the high school.

(d) Definite planning for adequate international discussions in the church school, the Christian Endeavor or other young people's society, the Y. M. C. A., and the Y. W. C. A.

(e) Larger support of foreign missions. Some churches and some classes support a foreign worker themselves. Some organize special appeals for various forms of foreign relief such as the Near East Relief.

(f) Organize a study course using the pamphlet by Kirby Page on *War*, or one of the others suggested.

(g) If there are any national or racial groups in the neighborhood which are looked down upon or oppressed,

could you enlist their cooperation in some common cause? One church threw open the parish house to a foreign group to use as they saw fit. Sometimes an outside speaker who has had experience with that particular group can outline a practical, concrete program.

(h) Resolutions on crucial international issues can be adopted and petitions signed to be sent to the state capital, to our Congress and President at Washington, or to various religious conferences.

(i) In some communities the class has gone in a body to the editors of the local papers to see that more and finer material is printed on international issues.

(j) See that the library of your church has good books on international questions and good periodicals such as the *World Tomorrow*. 396 Broadway, N. Y.

(k) Some churches have established a permanent "Peace Committee" which meets monthly to discuss what the church can do concretely to further peace.

6. Perhaps the most vital question we all have to face is what we individually are going to do about all this in our daily life and work. How can we be a friend to the foreigners we meet? How can we be true to our highest loyalties? What is our share in the "crusade for a Warless World"? *Have you begun to solve this problem?*

7. After this course is over, will you continue to read from the books and pamphlets listed in the bibliography? See *Appendix*, p. 114.

APPENDIX

PARABLE OF THE RICH HOUSEHOLDER [1]

World Politics and a Village Fire Department

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE

HERE we are living in a small village. This village is peculiar. It is a sort of enchanted village. We cannot get out of it. Usually, if we don't like the village wherein we live, we can leave it and settle down in another. But when we are once born into this village, there we must stay, whether we like it or not. Old men tell us there was a time when on this globe of ours there were several villages, but under the applications of steam and electricity the world has contracted in size and dwindled, until now there is no room on it for more than this one village, and the only way in which we can leave this village is by the gate of death.

Recently there has been in this village a tremendous conflagration which has burned down about a third of it, destroyed an immense amount of property, and killed a great many of the villagers. Even before the fire was more than partly under control the villagers got together and said: "This must never happen again." They said: "We are to blame. We never had an equipment for fighting fires. We never had, in fact, any fire department that was good for much, and consequently the fire almost mastered us. Now we will have the best fire department that we can get. We will equip it with every kind of up-to-date appliances if we can get them, and we shall be ready to do better work when such a danger occurs again.

"Moreover, we want to leave this village in better shape to our children than we have ever had it. We will band ourselves together into an organization for building a better village. We will call ourselves the Village Improvement Association, and we will have that in addition to our new fire company."

Well, virtually everybody joined that association and the new fire company. All the big householders went into it but three.

[1] Reprinted from the *Century Magazine*, May, 1924. May be secured as separate leaflet from the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, 6 East 39th St., N. Y.

THERE was one who was a great merchant in the village who was not asked to join. His name was Fritz, and he was not asked to join because most of the villagers thought that he had started the fire.

There was another big householder in the village who also was not invited to join. His name was Ivan, and he had the biggest farm in the village, but it was not very well cared for. The buildings were rather tumble-down. Just at the time of the fire Ivan went on a terrific spree, and when he was full of red hooch he stood out in the main highway of that burning village, and shouted hoarsely to the other villagers, "You think that is something of a fire, do you? You wait and see the fire I am going to kindle in a little while." That talk scared the villagers so much that they would not ask Ivan to join the new fire company. They thought that they would better wait until he sobered off.

But there was another big householder whom the villagers expected to be with them. They counted on him. His name was Sam. He lived at the west end of the village, just across a valley through which flows a brook. His farm was bigger than any one's except Ivan's and it was pretty well cared for. There were very good buildings on it, and he was regarded as perhaps the most prosperous villager. In fact, one of Sam's boys attended the initial meetings of the new fire company and the Village Improvement Association, but when that boy got home Sam scolded him and spanked him and sent him to bed. The disappointment and the shock of the rebuff were so great that the poor fellow never recovered.

SAM said to the astonished villagers, "No, I am not going to join you. I don't quite like your company or your plan. I don't care to have this one and that one in your crowd able to outvote me at the meetings and tell me where I can get on and off.

"There is Louis, the caterer. He owes me a lot of money, and he is not trying to pay it, so far as I can see. He has money enough to fill his house full of guns and revolvers and ammunition, yet he is not trying to pay me a cent. Also, every time he sees Fritz, Louis has a brainstorm and tries to hit him.

"Then, there is Mr. Bull, who runs that big department store. I don't want to get tied up with Mr. Bull. He has six sons. That Bull family can outvote me at any time. It seems to me that there is too much Bull about this scheme."

The villagers said to Sam: "You are very much mistaken; at least we think you are. Those Bull boys are not going to vote as the old man says. If you think they are, you can ask his oldest boy, Patrick."

"Besides," they said, "you know those tenant farmers of yours on the south side of your farm. They have all come into the fire company and the Village Improvement Association, and they don't dare to wink unless you tell them they can.

"Moreover," they said, "you have mistaken the character of our association. It is not run on military lines at all. We cannot order you to get out of bed at midnight and run down to a fire if you don't want to. This is a purely voluntary fire company. But you know perfectly well the fire is not out yet. Every time a wind of hate blows through our village, the embers glow and the sparks fly. They might just as easily fly over your buildings again as they did before, and your property might be the first to get burned the next time." Sam said, "I will have a fire company of my own." And the villagers said: "How can you have a fire company of one? Do you expect Fritz and Ivan to join with you?"

Sam mulled over that for two years, and then gave it up.

MEANWHILE the villagers went to work. They organized their new fire company. They got the best machines that they could afford to buy and the best appliances available. They employed mechanics to install and man a water system that they thought would throw a stream of water over the most imperial sky-scraper in the village. They went to work also with their Village Improvement Association. They laid new sidewalks. They started a new hospital. They began to drive the drug peddlers off the streets, and they cleaned up the red-light district.

Then they laid it all before Sam, and Sam said, "No, no. You are too quarrelsome a lot for me to do anything with." "But," they said, "quarrelsome? Look at what

we have done. We have had our fire company and our association only this short time, relatively speaking for only four months, and in that time we have answered fifteen alarms, and put out at least five actual fires. The last one was a very nasty fire, very nasty indeed. It started out just like the big one.

"It started in that dark alley between the premises of Tony, the macaroni manufacturer, and of Constantine, the fruit peddler. The fire company responded, and all the villagers ran in; the pinochle club and even Tammany Hall sent in contingents to help. The result was that the whole of that fire was stamped out, relatively speaking, in twenty minutes. Wasn't that pretty good work?" And Sam said, "I congratulate you on having something so helpful for you, but for me it is a closed incident."

Once more the villagers said: "Quarrelsome? See what we have done for Otto, the delicatessen dealer, who was Fritz's particular friend. He was virtually burned out in the fire. There was nothing left of his store and house but a shell. His stock was all destroyed. He and his family were on the verge of starvation, and they thought they were facing beggary on the cold street. We chipped in. Some of us who had been for a long time Otto's enemies were the first to help. We rebuilt his store and gave him a new stock. He is now doing business again at the old place, and he and his family are happy." Sam said, "That is well done. I am willing to help on that." And he did. Then Sam unbent a little more and said: "I will tell you what I will do. I will let some of my boys come to some of your meetings, and they can sit there and take notes. They can give you advice if you wish them to, but it must be understood that they are merely unofficial observers. They cannot sign anything or commit me to anything. I am not going to be responsible for any of the expenses incurred."

WELL, the villagers were glad to have help from Sam on any basis or in any manner, whatever they may have said about it among themselves. There are rumors that even some members of Sam's household wonder whether that kind of cooperation, if it is cooperation, is exactly what the richest and most prosperous and happiest householder in the village should give.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AT FOUR YEARS OF AGE[1]

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE

WHAT IS THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS?

An association of fifty-four States, formed in 1919–1920 for the promotion of the common welfare, the maintenance of international law and justice and the prevention of wars.

How is it Supported?

By annual contributions of about $5,000,000 from its fifty-four members, a sum which represents the average cost of two hours of war to the United States in 1918.

How Nearly Universal is the League?

It comprises the whole organized world except the following States: Afghanistan, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Hedjaz (the principal Arab State in a group of eight), Iceland, Mexico, Russia, Tibet, Turkey, and the United States of America.

WHAT HAS THE LEAGUE ACCOMPLISHED IN ITS FIRST FOUR YEARS?

Wars Averted or Stopped

It has handled six controversies in which war was threatened or actually begun, viz.: over the Aaland Islands (Sweden *vs.* Finland), the Vilna district (Poland *vs.* Lithuania), Upper Silesia (Poland *vs.* Germany), Albanian boundaries (Albania *vs.* Yugo-Slavia), Bulgarian refugees (Rumania, Yugo-Slavia and Greece *vs.* Bulgaria), and murder of Italian officers followed by invasion of Ionian Islands (Italy *vs.* Greece). In the last case the League suggested the terms of final settlement and rapidly and successfully mobilized the public opinion of the world against the warlike methods of the Italian Government.

[1] May be secured as separate leaflet from the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, 6 East 39th St., N. Y.

War-Prisoners Brought Home

By the agency of Dr. Nansen it has returned to their homes, at a cost of about £400,000, as many as 427,386 prisoners of war belonging to twenty-six different nationalities.

Refugees Succored

It has through the same Commissioner brought help to many of the million and a half of Russian refugee exiles in Western Europe and especially to the thousands of them around Constantinople, and also to thousands of Greek and Armenian refugees from Asia Minor.

Epidemic Diseases Checked and Controlled

It has through its Public Health Organization maintained a heroic struggle on the eastern frontiers of Poland against typhus and other diseases carried especially by emigrants from Russia, and is now extending this beneficent work to other danger zones in the Mediterranean and African worlds.

World-wide Effort Directed Against Dangerous and Criminal Commerce

It is trying to control and regulate the traffic in opium and other noxious drugs, and to stamp out the traffic in women and children.

Labor Conditions Studied

It has established in the International Labor Organization a central agency for efforts to study and improve conditions of labor and relations between employers and wage-earners. Sixteen Conventions framed and adopted by the Organization as bases for new legislation have already received more than one hundred ratifications from various States, and as many more ratifications have been recommended by the responsible authorities.

Reconstruction Facilitated

It has charted the roads of financial, economic, and trade reconstruction by the work of two great Commissions and a series of international conferences; in particular, it has helped to save Austria from economic collapse and is now about to render a similar service to Hungary.

Armament Problems Grappled

It is grappling seriously and sanely with the problem of reduction of armaments and mutual guarantees of protection. One of the chief obstacles to success is the absence of the United States, from which there comes a great private traffic in arms and munitions of war.

World Court Created

It has created at The Hague the Permanent Court of International Justice, which, before it is two years old, has settled nine questions.

Disputed Territories Governed

It is the ultimate authority for the government, until 1935, of the Saar Valley with 650,000 inhabitants, and behind the local government of the Free City of Danzig with 200,000 inhabitants.

Backward Peoples Protected

It has created in its Mandates Commission an authority which each year publicly reviews what has been done in the colonial areas that were taken from Germany and entrusted to various Powers.

Complaining Minorities Befriended

It has established the machinery whereby the complaints of racial, religious, and linguistic minorities become known to the world, and receive friendly consideration.

Treaties Made Known

It has established the rule of publicity for international agreements by registering and publishing more than five hundred treaties made by its members.

World-wide Information Provided

It publishes monthly bulletins, official journals, and reports of all commissions, which may be obtained from "League of Nations, Geneva, Switzerland," or from "World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Mass."

World Business Administered

It maintains in the Secretariat and in the Labor Office two permanent staffs of experts always on the job and devoted to the organized administration of international affairs of

common concern. The two staffs together number about seven hundred fifty, chosen from about forty States.

World Advisory Committee Maintained

It has in its Council a permanent consultative committee, which can be summoned on brief notice and which may consider anything that threatens world-peace, and which directs the business of the organized world in the League. This is no Super-State, but a Family Council. Each member retains a right of Veto.

Annual World Parliament Held

It maintains in the Assembly an annual world conference, which controls the purse of the League, elects the majority of the Council and turns the searchlight of full information and public discussion on everything done within, by, and for the League of Nations.

CHURCH, STATE AND WAR[1]

Unquestionably the pulpit is becoming increasingly in earnest over getting rid of war. Almost any preachers' meeting will now pass a ringing denunciation of war as criminal and sinful. To it can usually be added a reasonably general statement about the causes of war, urging the government to adopt policies that lead away from it and not toward it. But when it comes to the immediate steps that might end war, the churches wait upon the state. And that not only in time. They neither propose to take any immediate steps themselves, nor do they urge any upon the state.

Just how far is this attitude likely to get us? If the churches want to get war outlawed and ended, what likelihood is there that the state will move to that end? The most favorable opportunity is certainly in this country. It is a commonplace that the United States enjoys the most advantageous position in the world from which to begin the measures that would destroy the war system which the churches are so freely denouncing. But while the churches are thus satisfying their feelings, what is the government of the United States actually doing? Since the Washington conference, which has put so many church people comfortably to sleep in the illusion that we had started the process of disarmament, what have been our acts and policies? The present administration stands squarely for an increased army and navy. The turn of our decrepit political machinery, whose most evident remaining capacity is the care of "lame ducks," has landed a bond broker in the war department, and we now have salesmanship, hustle, and business method applied to preparedness for war. When they discuss in the British parliament the possibility of limitation of aerial and chemical warfare, which of course is the vital essence of future conflict, it is the process of chemical preparedness in the United States that is the clinching argument of the militarists to defeat the peace-seekers. In preparation for what we are assured will be the greatest struggle of history, the whole industrial plant of the country is being mobilized for war and contracts are signed with every manufacturer who can produce any sort of war

[1] Editorial in *The Christian Century*, Feb. 7, 1924.

material, to go into effect the moment war is declared. Thus is the memory of past war profits and the lure of future gain enlisted on the side of war. The militarization of youth in schools, colleges, and training camps increases in strength and efficiency. It is promoted by the most skillful publicity propaganda and has drawn within its mesh many of those interested in the education and physical training of youth in what we call Christian institutions.

It must be remembered that all this is but the fulfillment of the duty of the war department. We put a secretary of war into office to make war, not peace. How else shall he be faithful to the trust we have committed to him, except to pursue it with the utmost energy and persuade us of the value of the enterprise? Yet it is a strange irony that on the wall which encloses the financial establishment from which the secretary of war came, there is a tablet which says, " On this spot William Lloyd Garrison first published the Liberator." It is a deeper irony that the diplomatic records of the opening of the late world conflict make it clear beyond dispute that it was the militarists who gave the final fatal push that sent the hesitant, groping diplomats over the precipice into the abyss, where they dragged the millions.

How stands the case in the matter of the navy? The Washington conference, which eliminated for us some menace in the Pacific Ocean has but transferred competitive navalism from battleships to lighter craft, and we are certainly not the last or least force in stimulating that struggle. We attempt to get around the stipulations of that conference in the matter of elevating the guns in existing battleships, after England has decided, when her navalists attempted the same thing, that it could not ethically be done. We have sent two naval expeditions to South America, one to Brazil and one to Peru, to preach the gospel of a bigger navy and to give instruction in naval matters. Already the results are seen in the stirring up of ill will and jealousy among those who before were moving toward disarmament and peace. Thus does our navy department make business for our steel and munition plants and undo what was done by those who put up that " Christ of the Andes " in which our church peace forces have so eloquently put their trust.

This, then, is how the matter at issue stands between church and state. While the churches are denouncing war

and respectfully urging the state to turn away from it, our government is definitely and strenuously engaged in war making. And the increase of preparedness is like a series in arithmetical progression, automatically rolling up all the vested interests and feelings that accrue behind the military and naval establishments and thus making disarmament less likely. If the church has nothing more to do or say, its case looks hopeless. The elimination of war involves definite disarmament and there is only one way to get disarmament, and that is to disarm. But every reference of a church group to this matter is qualified by some words about national security or defense or the attitudes and policies of other nations. The interpretation of these terms, in the nature of the case, is forced by the preparedness policy of the militarists, and the church is thus deliberately putting itself in the position of the German socialists, whose hands were tied and mouths shut as soon as they voted the budget for national defence.

There are other factors in the conduct of the state which are making for war while the churches are talking against it. One does not have to accept any theory of the state as the expression of economic power in order to understand the relations between capitalism and government. It is only necessary to use one's eyes. In the last few years various of our banking houses have made loans to Central American states, whose security is the customs and sometimes other parts of the financial machinery of those countries. Thus the war government is hypothecated as security for the loans and these states are to some extent annexed by our banking interests. Now South America is getting drawn into the same process. In the latest of these loans, the state department practically validated the transaction and arranged that any dispute from default should be settled by our chief justice. Thus an administrative department did what the Senate had positively refused to do by treaty. The bond house which is selling this loan not incorrectly informs prospective investors that it is inconceivable that our navy should not stand by the obligations thus secured.

Above and beyond these transactions is the larger fact that, under the direct stimulation of our department of commerce as well as under the general law that capital flows into the region of largest returns, our foreign investment is being rapidly increased despite the needs of this country. All these

things move irresistibly towards war. It was the same process that brought Germany into clash with England. While our churches are studying the economic causes of war, the natural development of capitalism in this country is making for war before our eyes. And here is the real cause of the drive for the expansion of our army and navy. There is some financial propaganda about its value to control the menace of the Reds. It comes out of the same circles that are promoting foreign investment. Here is the inner force which is militarizing a nation that is pacifist in sentiment.

There are two forces which lead the democratic state into war-making policies and preparations: nationalism and capitalism. They constitute a large part of the nature of our government. Put together, they inevitably produce imperialism, and no state into whose constitution they enter sufficiently to produce this result can possibly escape war. Yet the churches in their blindness look to such a state to end war. They approach it with deference and "respectfully request," or growing occasionally bolder, they "respectfully urge." There is something almost worshipful in their attitude, as though they too were hypnotized by the cult of nationalism, which has come to replace Christianity, after Christianity emancipated the early Christians from its thralldom. What is this state upon whose ways the forces of religion wait with such respect? In so far as it has visible expression in its executives, it is a company of very ordinary men who show neither much intelligence, skill, nor moral quality.

Only by the illusion of distance and the subtle effect of the abstraction we call government could our denominations have come to feel any pride when the ordinary type of executive happens to give one of them a nominal allegiance. It was to bigger men than these that preachers of other days brought the commands of God. In so far as the state is the expression of capitalism, it is manifestly the enemy of religion, for we cannot serve God and mammon, and to use the national life for the appropriation and organization of capital is nothing but the cult of mammon. In so far as the state is the organization of nationalism, again it is the enemy of Christianity. Was not this the issue between Jesus and the leaders of his nation, that for them the kingdom of God was nationalistic, while for him it was the life of God in the whole wide human family? To wait upon the nationalistic, capitalistic state in

the matter of ending war is but to give the enemies of religion time to destroy it.

One has only to talk with intelligent youth in or out of the church to know that the chief reason why religion has lost power with them is because the church has surrendered moral authority to the state. The Christian church cannot get the music of God into the ears of the modern world so long as it plays second fiddle to the state. Somewhere there must be a voice to say to our elected officials, "Thus saith the Lord," to assert some higher guidance and control for humanity than the nationalistic, capitalistic state with its war-making tendencies. If the church cannot evolve this moral and spiritual authority, where else can it be found? If the development of the church in recent years in activities of public welfare, in cooperation with the government, means that the church is to be subordinate to politicians in the making of the vital policies of the common life, then our last condition is worse than the first. Have we separated the church and state for this, that the church should finally be controlled by the state? There was evil enough, in all conscience, in the domination of the state by an ecclesiastical hierarchy, but at least and at its worst, the church did represent some higher authority than the factional, self-seeking, political organization. . . .

But it ought to be possible for a democratic church in a democratic age to stand free of the state and assert the supremacy of spiritual law. This can never be done by the utterance of mere platitudes or general statements. If the words of the church are to have moral authority, they must involve acts and require a change in the direction of living. . . . In older days the church had the dread power of excommunication. It was often viciously used merely to exalt the prestige of the church, but at times it did voice the higher interests of the common life and put up a higher standard than that of temporal authority.

If the church wants to prevent the state from destroying mankind in war, let it today morally excommunicate the state by separating itself from it in deed as well as in word. Let it say that it will never again use the ecclesiastical function in support of war. This will give mankind a moral base from which to change those parts of the nature of the state which now inevitably make for war. Then let the church fill its words with authority by proceeding to the necessary deeds.

LOYALTY TO CHRIST IN TIME OF WAR [1]

ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE

To the question, "What is your supreme loyalty?" there is only one answer which we would be willing to give. One after another, would we not promptly and unequivocally answer, "My supreme loyalty is to Jesus Christ"?

We cannot but repeat after Jesus himself that searching saying: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Nor can we fail to see that although in this saying only two great human relationships are mentioned, others are implied. He, for instance, that loveth his university more than Christ is not worthy of Christ. He that loveth his country more than Christ is not worthy of Christ. Are not these admissions also involved? And who among us would hesitate to make them?

When Jesus said: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me," he was, of course, thinking of himself not merely as a human individual but as a spiritual symbol of the kingdom of God. Supreme loyalty to him meant supreme loyalty to the kingdom of God in heaven and on earth. And let us keep steadily before us the important fact that when a man pledges supreme loyalty to the kingdom of God, far from surrendering any lesser loyalty, he glorifies every other loyalty.

But for increasing numbers of persons — a peculiarly torturing fact — the higher loyalty and the lesser loyalties do sometimes seem to clash. In our heart of hearts we really want to be supremely loyal to Jesus Christ. But we are dwelling in the midst of a civilization that is semi-pagan. We live and move and have our being in a world that does not, on the whole, accept, much less practise, the principles of Jesus. We are citizens of a state that is less than Christian. How, then, is it going to be possible for us to discharge the duties of citizenship in a less than Christian state; to live and

[1] From the *Federal Council Bulletin*, May–June, 1924.

labor in a world where hideously unchristian deeds are not only done but commanded, to dwell in the midst of a semi-pagan civilization, and maintain through everything our loyalty to Christ?

This moral problem becomes excruciatingly difficult when a Christian is ordered by a less than Christian state, in a semi-pagan world, to take up arms against his fellows. I do not happen to know anything about the officer in charge of the submarine which discharged the torpedo that sank the *Lusitania*. But let us suppose that in his heart of hearts he wanted to be loyal to Jesus Christ. He received an order from his government to sink a ship carrying munitions — and women and children. What should he have done? In time of war, a man who really desires to be loyal to Jesus Christ may be ordered to bomb a city, or to explode poison-gas shells over it, or to foul its water supply, or to cut off its food supply, or (it is now hinted) to release disease germs in it, or in some other fiendish way to inflict suffering, not only upon men, but upon women and children. What, under such circumstances, should a Christian do? When Christ says, "Treat every man as a brother," and the state says, "Treat certain men as your enemies;" when Christ says, "Maintain toward every man an attitude of good will," and the state says, "Good will toward enemies is not permissible," what should a Christian do?

Now this is a question which every modern disciple of Jesus ought to be putting to his own soul. It is a question, which, in my judgment, cannot longer be evaded. And it is a question which every follower of Christ will have to answer for himself. You cannot answer it for me. I cannot answer it for you. No man may answer it for his brother. If some disciple of Jesus comes to the conclusion that, in the event of another war, there is but one thing for him to do, and that is to serve his country by bearing arms, it is not for me, nor for any other man, to say to him that in that case he will cease to be a Christian. And if some disciple of Jesus comes to the conclusion that, in the event of another war, he must, in some way, serve his country, but that he cannot, under any circumstances, consent to bear arms, to kill, to inflict suffering upon women and children, it is not for me, nor for any man, to say to him that in that case he will cease to be a Christian. Certainly, let me add, it is not for the Christian church to dis-

courage any of her sons or daughters who are making earnest, and even agonizing efforts to be loyal to Jesus Christ. Whatever attitude the state may feel obliged to take toward the "conscientious objector," the Christian church ought not to make more difficult his already terribly difficult path. If the state decides that in the interest of public safety he should be sent to jail, the church cannot keep him out; but the church can, and should, let him feel that he possesses her profoundest respect for his brave allegiance to what seems to him to be the command of Christ.

As for the church herself, I, for my part, feel very sure that she ought never again, in her official capacity, to bless war. She cannot dictate to her sons and daughters how they shall solve their moral problem. She must not, in my judgment, attempt to legislate in respect to a matter which concerns so vitally the individual conscience. But this one thing she may do. She may refuse to call holy that which is hideous. She may refuse to call right that which is wrong. She may humbly confess her own share of the awful failure to prevent war. But by what kind of moral hocus-pocus may she justify her shame? Let the church never assume a holier-than-thou attitude, but, in the name of truth, let her never again say that black is white. And, in the name of Christ, let her never again officially participate in an orgy of killing and hate. Let her keep herself in some truly and nobly Christian sense "above the battle" — above the massacre and the madness — so that anguished men and women on both sides of the conflict may know that there is, in a madhouse world, at least one great organization that is keeping sane and calm and kind and Christlike; and by that knowledge be comforted and sustained and filled with hope. If, in the event of another war, the church should maintain an attitude such as this, is it not at least possible that, at the close of the war, she could influence for the good of all the terms of peace?

Let us return to the thought with which we started, that our supreme loyalty is to Jesus Christ. If our profession of Christianity amounts to anything, each of us in his own way, but each of us in some way, must strive to crown him Lord of all. It is hardly to be expected that we shall all choose the same way of trying to rid the world of its greatest existing curse — the curse of war and of the whole war system. But, in Christ's name, let us choose some way! How dare we, as

Christians, remain passive while forces are generating to hurl the world into another catastrophe unimaginably awful? How dare we let governments blunder along into another abyss through lack of moral initiative? Is it not for Christians, of all people, to furnish moral initiative? To take with respect to war a position in advance of the average conscience and then by unsleeping educational effort bring the long-suffering (because uninformed) masses of mankind to the point where they will demand that war be placed in the same category with dueling, piracy and slavery?

Then, but not until then, will loyalty to Christ no longer clash with loyalty to Cæsar. For then church and state will together stand at the feet of Jesus and crown him Lord of all.

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR IN AMERICA[1]

Introducing the reader to a book which merits serious reading and consideration.

A Reveiw by

ANTON T. BOISEN

"In a world where conformity is easy and independent thinking hard, where demonstrably heresy has always been the growing point of society, where governments of all sorts are often stupid and cruel, reasonable men are constrained to do some fresh thinking on the duty of civil disobedience." Such may be taken as the key-note of Mr. Thomas's book on the conscientious objector, for while it purports to be a systematic history of the little group of brave men who, in the time when the crowd-mind was lashed by the fury of war, kept the faith that was in them, it is really much more than a chronicle of their experiences. It is written with a keen insight into human nature, with a true understanding of the difficult social problems which are involved, with a balance of judgment and a charm of style which will contribute greatly toward clear thinking on this important problem.

As historian of the conscientious objectors Mr. Thomas speaks with authority. His position as editor of the *World Tomorrow*, as a leader in the Civil Liberties Union and in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, brought him into closest touch with the objectors from the beginning. His conclusions are also amply supported by documentary evidence. Although he thus writes from the point of view of the objectors themselves, as one who challenges the right of the state to conscript men's consciences, who looks upon war as a means which always frustrates the attainment of any high ends for which it may be invoked, and who regards the Great War in particular as no struggle of light against darkness, but a conflict between rival imperialisms, he does not fail to recognize the lofty motives of many who engaged in it or to be fair to those whose view-points differ from his own.

The reader who is not acquainted with the facts and who has heard so many things said for and against the conscientious objectors perhaps will be surprised to find how few of them

[1] The Conscientious Objector in America, by Norman Thomas, with an Introduction by Robert M. LaFollette. B. W. Huebsch, N. Y., 1923. ($2.00.)

there were — only some 4,000 who made any claim for exemption on religious or other grounds and of these only four hundred and fifty who did not in the end find some form of service satisfactory to the government. He will be further struck by the fact that fully three-fourths of these were religious literalists, men who were honest and sincere but were not possessed of broad social vision and only one-fourth therefore whose objection was based upon rational, humanitarian or political grounds. These men were found segregated in every important camp in the country. Most of them were willing to accept alternative service, but some were absolutists who refused any form of service whatsoever. One of the tragedies of the situation for these men lay in the fact that they were compelled to go through a long struggle with officers over issues apparently petty in order to preserve their status as objectors. It thus came to pass that a course of action which they had pictured to themselves as unflinching testimony to their dearest beliefs degenerated often into a long wrangle with officers over potato paring or saluting.

Mr. Thomas is not inclined to magnify the brutalities. He recognizes the fact that in many camps the treatment received was considerate and kind and the objectors were allowed a good deal of liberty. But brutalities there were. They were inevitable under the circumstances, and there are numerous incidents fully authenticated which are quite on a par with the atrocities attributed to the Germans in the recent war or to the Spanish inquisitors of old. Objectors were confined in unsanitary guard-houses, sometimes in damp, unheated cells during the winter months without blankets. They were forcibly clad in uniform, beaten, pricked with bayonets, jerked about with ropes around their necks, tortured by the water cure. In a few cases they were immersed in the filth of latrines, eyes were gouged and eardrums broken by beating. And solitary confinement and manacling were methods of treatment recognized and approved by the War Department; not until December, 1918, was manacling forbidden.

The severity of the treatment is indicated strikingly in the sentences imposed by the courts martial upon the five hundred and three absolutist objectors. These included seventeen death sentences, one hundred forty-two life imprisonments, eighty-six for twenty-five years or more, seventy-

three for twenty years, forty-seven for fifteen years, ninety-two for ten years, and only forty-four for five years or less. While none of the extreme sentences was carried out the objectors had to pass through many tribulations before they were modified. In any case their extreme severity as compared with punishments imposed for other offences indicates the official attitude.

The blame for this treatment of the conscientious objectors Mr. Thomas is careful not to lay at the door of any particular individuals in high office. These individuals he regards as merely pawns in the hands of the mighty forces which had been unloosed to goad the people into war. He does find it hard to forgive the almost total failure of the minority of liberals to function in this crisis. Most noticeable of all he finds the failure of the Christian church to speak even in behalf of mercy for the imprisoned objectors. Resolutions asking justice for Ulster were passed by certain church bodies during this period, but none in behalf of the conscientious objectors in America. Great concern over the fate of the Armenians was shown by other bodies, but none for the men imprisoned for conscience' sake in our own land. And not only did the religious bodies fail to function in behalf of mercy, but the chaplains and the Y. M. C. A. secretaries often showed themselves the worst enemies of the conscientious objectors, perhaps because these representatives of the church in arms must have felt that the very existence of the conscientious objector implied a vital criticism of the militant church program. As for the public at large, it seems far more concerned about the right to drink than the right to think.

That from the standpoint of the state the conscientious objector was indeed a most trying problem and that without conscription the Great War could not have been fought, Mr. Thomas frankly acknowledges. The objector of the absolutist type is a challenge to the basic ideas of men and to their instinctive obedience on which the philosophy of the modern state and the practice of war are built. It is in fact against the doctrine of the divinity of the state even more than against war that conscientious objection is primarily effective. But to compel a man to be true to his fellows by being untrue to himself is contrary to our cherished ideals of individual freedom, democratic liberty and Christian love, and opens the way for unlimited exploitation, imperialism and militarism.

ARMAMENTS ARE NOT A POLICE FORCE

An argument frequently offered for the maintenance of large national armaments is that they are necessary for police power. It must be remembered, however, that even though armies and navies are sometimes used for police purposes, yet there are several striking differences between a police force and a national armament:

1. Even under our faulty penal system, the most efficient police force is that which *protects* life and property, including those of the offender; the most efficient armament is that which can destroy the most life and property.

2. A police force deals with the criminal himself, always without injury to innocent bystanders if possible. Armaments, by the very nature of modern war, cannot get at the *real* criminal, but instead kill millions of relatively innocent people who are usually either the dupes of the real criminals, or are compelled by them against their own will to bear arms.

3. Police forces never fight with each other — the police of New York never march out to do battle with the police of Chicago or London. In war, each national armament calls *itself* a police force, and each believes the other to be the criminal *en masse*.

4. Police work under a definite, recognized code of law; they apprehend the offender and bring him before a qualified court where his case is examined coolly and impartially, serving the double end of protection for society and redemptive punishment for the offender. Armaments work under no accepted code of law, and instead of bringing the enemy (usually not the real offender) before an impartial court (which does not exist) they seek to destroy him, his property, and all his people.

5. It is easy to conceive an adequate police force and to provide for it without comparison or competition with other police forces. Armaments, however, are never large enough; each addition by one nation means a similar addition by rivals, with the result that the " experts " of every nation continually demand more and more.

6. Police power is one of the chief bulwarks of a law-abiding civilization. Competent judges agree that another great world war, in which armaments will do their worst, will in all probability destroy our civilization.

THE GROWTH OF A PRESS LEGEND [1]

Cologne *Zeitung* **(Germany):**

"When the fall of Antwerp got known the church bells were rung." (Meaning in Germany.)

The *Matin* **(Paris):**

"According to the Cologne *Zeitung*, the clergy of Antwerp were compelled to ring the church bells when the fortress was taken."

The *Times* **(London):**

"According to what *The Matin* has heard from Cologne, the Belgian priests who refused to ring the church bells when Antwerp was taken have been driven away from their places."

The *Corriere della Sera* **(Milan, Italy):**

"According to what the *Times* has heard from Cologne via Paris, the unfortunate Belgian priests who refused to ring the church bells when Antwerp was taken have been sentenced to hard labor."

The *Matin* **(Paris):**

"According to information to the *Corriere della Sera* from Cologne via London, it is confirmed that the barbaric conquerors of Antwerp punished the unfortunate Belgian priests for their heroic refusal to ring the church bells by hanging them as living clappers to the bells with their heads down."

The return to "traditions of candour" promised by the Cologne *Gazette* has been as difficult for the press as a return to normal conditions in other fields has been difficult.

[1] From *The Power of the Press for Peace and War* (pamphlet), published by the National Council for Prevention of War.

POINTS OF STRAIN BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

SIDNEY L. GULICK

Relations between America and Japan have been greatly improved during the past three years. For ten years and more before the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament (November, 1921) there had been growing talk of "the inevitable war for the mastery of the Pacific." That foolish and dangerous talk has now happily almost ceased. Because of the Washington Conference, Japan and America reached a fair degree of mutual understanding and confidence regarding naval building programs and national policies in the Pacific Ocean and in China. The most serious "points of strain" have thus been overcome.

But there still remains one unsolved problem — the status and the treatment of Japanese in the United States, particularly on the Pacific Coast. In regard to this, much tension still remains because much misinformation has been broadcasted all over the land.

Facts about Japanese Immigration

Chinese immigration was stopped by law in 1882. The return of Chinese laborers during the next two decades created a labor vacuum. This led to Japanese immigration, which began in the nineties and increased rapidly after 1900. During the years from 1899 to 1908, about 140,000 Japanese entered the United States (including Hawaii). No statistics of departures are available for those years.

Severe economic competition of Japanese with white laborers in California at once began, and led to more or less wrongdoing on both sides and to an increasingly insistent anti-Japanese agitation, which demanded a Japanese exclusion law. The Japanese government recognized the difficulties developing in California and the essential justice of the Pacific Coast attitude. But it felt that a Congressional law excluding their people from coming to the United States would be humiliating. That was the point of strain in 1906–1907. How to meet the essential needs of both sides was the problem.

The solution was found in the "Gentlemen's Agreement." Japan agreed to stop giving passports to new laborers coming to continental United States, it being mutually understood that there would be no American legislation against Japanese. Those already here would be permitted, after a temporary visit to Japan, to return again to America, and they might also bring with them or send for their "parents, wives or children."

This Agreement reduced Japanese immigration from 30,226 in 1907, the last year of free immigration, to 15,803 in 1908, and to 3,111 in 1909, the first year of the full operation of the Agreement. Since that time there has been a continuous stream of arrivals and departures. In seven out of these fifteen years, departures exceed arrivals. The excess of admittances over departures during this period was 8,681 in continental America, and 7,415 in Hawaii. Distinguishing between the sexes, there has been a steady excess departure of males, the total for the fifteen years being 22,737. The decrease of males was more than balanced by the increase of females — "wives and children," who have come to join husbands and parents. The excess admittances of females was 38,833.

Turning from the matter of immigration, we note that Japanese population in the United States has been steadily increasing, chiefly through the birth of children. Much wild talk by agitators has been indulged in about the enormous growth of Japanese population and fabulous birth rates. The following table, based on the United States Census, shows the facts:

JAPANESE IN THE UNITED STATES (United States Census)

	Continental United States		Hawaii		California	
	1910	1920	1910	1920	1910	1920
Total	72,157	111,010	79,675	109,274	41,356	71,952
Male	63,070	72,707	54,784	62,644	35,116	45,414
Female	9.087	38,303	24.891	46,630	6,240	26,538
Foreign born	67,744	81,338	59,786	60,688	35,116	51,191
Native born	4,413	29,672	19,889	48,586	6,240	20,761
Percentage of total population			41.5	42.7	1.7	2.0

Anti-Japanese Legislation

When the Japanese laborers began to find how great were the profits of agriculture, many sought to be more than day

laborers. Then began the period of leasing. A few became so prosperous that they bought farm lands. These conditions soon led to the rapid development of Japanese agricultural districts, areas where they gathered in disproportionate numbers. Japanese land-buying and Japanese "colonies" aroused opposition, started the next anti-Japanese movement in California, and led to the first alien land law in 1913. It forbade selling land to Japanese, but permitted leasing land for not more than three years. This law practically forced Japanese to move every three years. It was, of course, bad for the soil, bad for the homes and bad for the children. It interfered with Japanese "Americanization," with their building of American homes and with their proper economic advancement.

In 1920 California adopted a still more drastic alien land-law, which forbade not only sale and lease but even the making of crop-contracts. Several other laws were also passed. All have been tested in the courts, some being declared unconstitutional. In November, 1922, the United States Supreme Court rendered judgment declaring the Japanese "ineligible for citizenship" under the existing naturalization law, and in November, 1923, it validated the laws which forbid sale, leases and crop-contracts. The effect of these decisions is to force back to migrant day-labor practically all Japanese who remain agriculturists. Serious conditions now threaten not only Japanese agriculturists, but American owners of the land hitherto cultivated by Japanese.

Moreover, since Japanese have through the years largely gone into vegetable gardening, for which they are peculiarly fitted, it begins to look as though California were to have a vegetable and small fruit famine, with serious increase in the cost of living. Anti-Japanese agitators expect a large stream of white farmers to flood into California to take the lands thus far cultivated by Japanese. But no one can forecast results.

Congressional Legislation[1]

Extreme anti-Japanese agitators kept urging Congress to enact a rigid Japanese exclusion law. The Johnson immigration bill proposed to refuse admittance to the United States

[1] The writer of this article was unable to take into account events subsequent to May 15, 1924. The passage of the Immigration Law by Congress and its approval by the President on May 26 do not alter the facts herein set forth, but do serve to give added significance to the warning which Dr. Gulick's article contains.

of " aliens ineligible to citizenship." This was in direct violation of the treaty with Japan which gives the right to Americans and to Japanese to travel and reside and do business freely, each in the other's country. It also annulled the " Gentlemen's Agreement." The United States surely cannot afford to ignore and violate its treaty obligations.

Congress was also urged to pass a law that would deny American citizenship to American-born children of Japanese and Chinese parentage. The effect of this would be to create in America an Asiatic group always necessarily owing allegiance to a foreign government. This would be most unfortunate both for the United States and for Asiatics permanently living here. Our permanent population should owe allegiance only to our government.

Both of these proposals were needless, ill-considered and positively dangerous. Japan offered to reconsider the " Gentlemen's Agreement," if its actual working was deemed not satisfactory.

Both proposals were deeply offensive to Japan because they implied an intrinsic race inferiority which Japanese deeply resent and emphatically deny. The proposals could not be regarded otherwise than as " unfriendly." For the welfare of both America and Japan it is highly important that both countries shall live together as friendly neighbors. For we are to be neighbors for a thousand years — in fact as long as history continues.

The Solution

The solution of the American-Japanese problem is partly educational and partly legislative. Japanese who look forward to permanent residence in America need education in English, in American history and institutions, and in all that will help them to understand and live wholesomely with their American neighbors. Americans on the other hand need education regarding Japan and the Japanese, enabling them to be good and helpful neighbors.

Japan should promptly pass a law removing the difficulties of dual citizenship, for American-born children are citizens both of Japan and the United States. The " Gentlemen's Agreement " should be revised or a new treaty secured, which would restrict still more rigidly the coming to the United States of new immigrants for permanent residence here. And

in order to give those already lawfully here equality of treatment with that accorded every other people, the writer believes that the general standards of naturalization should be raised and that every one who is personally qualified should be admitted to citizenship regardless of race or nationality. In this age of close international and interracial contacts, there ought to be no "aliens ineligible to citizenship." The very genius of democracy requires this, to say nothing of the Christian ideal of universal human brotherhood. Immigration from Asia should be practically nil, but those who are here to stay should be invited to become full fledged American citizens.

Not one shred of evidence has been produced to prove that Japanese or Chinese are intrinsically unfit to become citizens. On the contrary, their diligence, thrift, studiousness, law-abiding character, loyalty and other virtues show that they are intrinsically fitted to make excellent citizens if they will personally qualify. To the solution of this important problem every true and loyal American citizen should give his thought and his effort.

POINTS OF STRAIN BETWEEN WHITE AND NEGRO AMERICANS

GEORGE E. HAYNES

Since the early days of the colonies one of the strains in the relations of white and Negro people has grown out of economic conditions. Negroes came to America under what some one has called a "pressing invitation." The colonists, in need of cheap labor, brought them as slaves. Indentured servants from England could no longer be supplied in sufficient numbers and the Indian protested with his tomahawk against enslavement.

In 1920, 42.5 per cent of all Negroes ten years of age and over gainfully employed were engaged in agriculture, forestry and animal husbandry; 22.1 per cent were in domestic and personal service, and 18.4 were in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. In the twenty years between 1890 and 1910 Negroes in the United States gainfully employed increased about 66.6 per cent in agriculture, about 129.5 per cent in trade and transportation; about 165.3 per cent in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, and about 65 per cent in domestic and personal service. These figures indicate a basis of race relations in the intermingling of thousands in daily contact which results in either pleasurable experience or frictional feeling.

In agriculture about one out of every four Negro farmers owns his farm; the other three are farm workers bearing the usual burdens of the landless, the poor and the ignorant, with the added burdens and disadvantages which race prejudice and previous conditions of servitude entail.

In the Ranks of Labor

In 1920 there were 340,000 more Negroes in the North and West than in 1910. This means that probably during the decade more than 500,000 Negroes migrated from the South to the North and West. In addition probably more than 300,000 have moved during the past three years. They

have entered by the thousands into the industrial occupations in such basic industries as iron and steel, garment and building trades, foundry and hardware plants, meat-packing, automobile and glass industries, and in many departments of railroad maintenance and operation. White workers in these industries are well organized into labor and trade unions. Negroes have not affiliated largely with organized labor because of previous color discrimination. Many of the local trades unions and councils have drawn the color line even where the national and international bodies have policies against any discrimination on account of creed or color. Hod carriers and cement workers have always freely admitted Negroes. Longshoremen's organizations have had no discriminations. The strain between the races will diminish as the numbers of Negro workers increase because the white workers will see the necessity of admitting them for their own self-protection into their organizations. Already some of the highly organized garment and building trades and other crafts are changing their practice under such pressure.

Disfranchisement

Another point of strain between the two races is found in local government and political life. There is fear in the South that the dark descendants of former serfs may as freemen divide political power, privileges and responsibilities with the descendants of the former master class. Beginning with Mississippi in 1890, ten Southern states passed suffrage laws which, while technically meeting the requirements of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, have been designed to disfranchise Negro voters. Devices such as tax tests, property tests, educational tests, the "grandfather clauses," understanding and character clauses in the hands of local registrars have been used to eliminate Negro voters in most states. For instance, in some areas voters are required to read and write sections of either the State or the United States Constitution to the satisfaction of the local registration judges; "understanding clauses" require the voter to understand and give an interpretation of the parts of such constitution as he reads or has read to him. The registration judges decide whether or not he meets the requirement satisfactorily. Of course, if it is not desired to have a Negro voter register he cannot qualify to the satis-

faction of the judges, whose decision is final unless the voter wants to test the matter in court. He will hardly do this when prevailing public opinion is against him. As increasing numbers of Negroes are becoming able to meet these tests and are seeking to exercise their right of franchise, friction increasingly arises. In Northern communities other tactics are used to manipulate and control the Negro voters who feel in many communities that they have large numbers but a minor voice in the vital matters of government.

Social Segregation

Following in the wake of the state constitutional amendments and other measures in Southern states which accomplished this disfranchisement of the Negro, legislation designed to segregate the races has increased interracial tension. Laws popularly known as "Jim Crow laws," which provide for separation of white and Negro passengers on street cars and in railroad trains, have been one of the greatest sources of irritation to Negro citizens. These laws generally provide that persons of color or African descent and those of white or Caucasian extraction shall be provided with separate seats in street cars or separate compartments and coaches on railroad trains. Missouri is the only southern state which has not passed laws for separation of the races on trains; Kentucky, Maryland and Missouri have not passed laws for such separation on street cars. The accommodations in the separate railroad coaches are supposed to be equal for the two races. As a matter of practice the accommodations for Negro passengers are usually quite unequal and in many cases very much worse than those for white passengers. Frequently a coach is divided with a partition that does not reach to the ceiling; one of the resulting compartments is used as a smoker for white men and the other compartment for Negro passengers — men, women and children. In much of the territory where such laws are in force it is difficult or impossible for a Negro to get Pullman car accommodation, and through some of this territory he would be in danger of violence if he did get it and tried to use it.

As Negroes have migrated in large numbers to northern industrial centers, another point of friction has arisen when they have sought to rent or buy houses with modern conveniences in blocks where sanitary arrangements, fire and

police protection and other advantages were obtainable. Negroes have not sought such neighborhoods because white people lived there but because of advantages which have usually been denied them elsewhere.

The Lynching Menace

One of the most tense interracial situations arises from the lynching evil. Three out of four of the persons recorded as lynched in the United States have been Negroes; between 1885 and 1923, of 4,182 persons lynched, 1,036 were white and 3,146 were Negro. Eighty-five of the Negroes were women. Nearly four-fifths of all victims in thirty-eight years have been accused of crimes other than rape or of acts that are not crimes under any law. This situation has broken down the morale and order of some communities, has set at naught the courts and other agencies of the law and has menaced the foundations of the home. Lynchings in the very sight of churches has belied the ideals of humanity for which they stand. Negroes in many parts of the country have shuddered at the howl of the mob. Thousands of Negroes live in half articulate fear that some turn of circumstance may put their lives in jeopardy. This makes quiet contentment remote and real interracial confidence impossible. Moral and spiritual fellowship between the races must lag heavily until such mob murder is abolished.

Public Education

Efforts of Negroes for larger and better provision for public school education has often been a friction point. One of the striking aspirations of the Negro people has been their eagerness for education. It is estimated that Negro illiteracy in 1860 was more than 90 per cent; in 1880 it was 70 per cent; in 1920 it had been reduced to 22.9 per cent. The illiteracy of the total population in 1880 was 17 per cent; in 1920, 6 per cent. Negro people have had a great barrier to overcome in the minds of white people who did not believe in the capacity of the Negro for educational development. There has been an intense and increasing sense of injustice among Negroes over the division of public school funds in the states where there are separate schools for these races, and over the cold reception they have had in educational institutions elsewhere.

In general the separate schools for Negroes have been inferior in buildings, equipment, pay of teachers and provision for their training. For instance, the official school directory of South Carolina for the school year 1922–23 reports that the average per capita expenditure according to enrollment was for white children, $42.41; for Negro children, $4.95; the average annual salary paid to white teachers of both sexes was $834.71; to Negro teachers, both sexes, $237.95; the expenditure for furniture and apparatus for white schools was $188,855.02; for Negro schools, $22,983.09; for the transportation of white children, $88,903.94; for Negro children, $53.00. In that school year there were enrolled 236,613 white children and 226,267 Negro children. There has been great improvement in some states in recent years. This is illustrated in the excellent developments in North Carolina where the state and local public school authorities are now spending more money on its Negro schools each year than it spent upon its whole public school system twenty-three years ago. There has been a corresponding response and appreciation on the part of the colored people of the state and increasing good feeling between the races.

Problems are Urgent

In the contacts between white and Negro Americans their experiences of friction vitally affect their emotional attitudes. This is a great field for the application of the ideals of justice and brotherhood. The interests of the landlord and tenant are complementary one to the other if they could only be recognized as such; the interests of the domestic servant and householder are mutual if the welfare of both parties is considered. Democracy cannot develop out of disfranchisement. Taxation without representation is as tyrannical in the twentieth century as it was in the eighteenth, even if the contending parties are of different racial stocks. The clarion call for removing these points of strain is louder than ever today because the American racial situation is closely related to similar racial situations in other parts of the world. The world is looking to us for example and guidance in the establishment of ideals for the new day of interracial cooperation.

FEAR AS THE FOE OF PEACE

NORMAN THOMAS

In Mark Twain's " Huckleberry Finn " there is an exceptionally vivid account of one of those feud fights which generation after generation has divided families, especially in the mountain regions of the South. You will remember that the Grangerfords were charming and gracious people who took in the poor wanderer, Huckleberry Finn, and made him at home among them. But all their charm and hospitality in no way modified their slavery to a tradition of vengeance, to a psychology of combined fear and hate, which year after year led them to engage in armed combat with their hereditary enemies.

Very much as we look upon these feuds in our own mountain districts or in Corsica, the world may come to look upon the wars which have devasted not families but nations. The psychology that leads to war is in important respects strikingly like the psychology of these feuds. If you talk disarmament to nations you are bound to be reminded of danger, either from some hereditary enemy or from some vague potential enemy. Not once but many times have I been asked, " If America should disarm what protection would we have against the Japanese, or against a new uprising of the Moslems of the world, or against this or that European power? " In each case the potential enemy is conceived as of quite other clay than ourselves, lusting for sheer joy of conquest, restrained from wholesale destruction only by fear of us.

The irony of the situation is that every nation justifies its own armament on exactly the same basis. " We," they say, " are righteous. Our cause is good. We meditate no aggression but we must be prepared against the enemy." Asia, from Japan to India, is stirred to fear and hate by reason of the white menace — a menace which, alas, we must confess

has heretofore been greater than the yellow menace of which we white peoples talk. I have recently seen an eloquent appeal of the Japanese Peace Society against certain rumored acts and regulations of the United States which menace the cause of peace. The sentiments expressed are not the sentiments of a people who themselves meditate conquest, but those of people possessed of a grievance which they fear will be magnified in Japan by the psychology of hate and dread.

If some angel from the skies beholding in pity our armaments and wars should visit us and ask each nation, "Why are you so feverishly prepared for destruction?" France would say, "I fear Germany," and Germany, "I fear France;" America, "I fear Japan," and Japan, "I fear America." And so all around the circle. Because of such fear, each nation groans under arms and, desiring peace, prepares for a war in which only Death can be the victor. For if there is anything that recent history proves, it is that you get what you prepare for and that the way to peace is not the way of preparation for war. And new war will be disastrous beyond our power to imagine.

In this general statement of the case, as is almost inevitable in general statement, I have over-simplified the facts and the problem. There are unfortunately some causes of war that are not matters of imagination or of a false psychology and we shall have to refer to them later. But first it is worth while to examine somewhat more at length this curious fear-hate psychology which makes out of gentle and kindly men and women a mob of fiends.

History in the Schools

One factor in it is history as history is commonly taught. Instead of being a guide to our path, a calm, clear light upon the road, history is an instigator of violence, a torch of destruction. That statement is not rhetorical or exaggerated. In every country the school-books tell the same monotonous — and false — story. "My country is better than its wicked neighbors." In every country the same evil and disproportionate emphasis has been placed upon war, almost to the exclusion of the deeds of those by whose labors life has been sustained and art and invention have enriched the race. Mr. Libby tells us the story of one history of France:

" We have in our office copies of a French primer, printed since the war. It was obtained from the publisher in Paris. On the cover one reads that it is the eighth edition, 381st to 410th thousand. Presumably 380,000 copies are in use among the children of France of the age of six or seven.

" In this primer we find a picture of German soldiers shooting down a French boy whose hands are raised in a dramatic gesture that no child could forget. There is a picture of the burning of the roof of Rheims Cathedral. There is this conversation: ' My child, you will not forget all these crimes? '

" ' I promise, mother.'

" These are sentences for the child to fill in: ' The Germans have killed ———. The Germans have destroyed ———. The Germans have burnt ———.'

" Hatred will thus be drilled into the soul of the little pupil that he will not outgrow this side of the presence of God. This is education for war."

We in America have no precise equivalent to that sort of story, but from time to time there are introduced into our legislatures laws which subordinate truth in the teaching of history to preconceived notions of patriotism. We have gone a step beyond the old doctrines, " My country right or wrong." We require that it shall be taught, " My country is always right." Thus is self-righteousness perpetuated, and since self-righteousness flourishes by contrast, hate of those less righteous than ourselves. To honor ourselves we make ogres out of our neighbors, and in fear of these ogres, arm ourselves against our own creatures. That very fear leads to war.

If by some great conflagration all the history books on both sides of the Rhine which tell the tales of a thousand years of war between the French and Germans could be destroyed, if a generation could grow up in forgetfulness of national history, the farmers and workers, the scientists and artists in France and Germany might more easily find a way to live together in peace. There is no inborn hate between children of different nations, races or color. It is acquired by a false system of education. If twenty French children could be exchanged with twenty Germans at birth, if the French could be educated as Germans and the Germans as French under the influence of history and nationalistic newspapers the French by birth would fight as Germans and the Germans as French.

This fear-hate psychology was intensified by the great war. It is not possible to wage modern warfare which involves regimenting not picked men-at-arms but whole nations without turning whole nations into a perfect fury of fear and hate. The occasional idealist may talk sincerely about fighting in love. On occasions we liked to be told that we had no quarrel with the German people, but such sentiments were not on the lips of liberty loan orators or of the drill sergeants who instructed our boys in bayonet charges. It was not love but hate which prevailed when it came to make the peace. In order to get peoples to fight they must be persuaded that the enemy is scarcely human, guilty of unnatural atrocities, enemies even of God. War correspondents cannot write the truth until after the war is over. Let any reader compare Sir Philip Gibbs' famous book " Now It Can Be Told," with war propaganda which was told as in war time. Or let him consider Admiral Sims' declaration that commanders of German submarines in general refrained from superfluous atrocities and that any nation in like plight might have done what Germany did. Such remarks would have been regarded as little short of treason in the war.

Will Irwin has given us an appalling picture of the physical consequences of new war fought from the air with poison-gas. We need some one who will draw an equally vivid picture of the psychological consequences of new war fought with all the unscrupulous instrumentalities of propaganda to induce nations to fear and hate as one. Poison-gas may destroy the body. Poison propaganda, as necessary to modern war as poison-gas, destroys the soul of peoples. In this world we need calm reason to guide our complex affairs and the war psychology extended into times of peace crushes the frail bark of reason with monstrous waves of unreasoned hate and panic fear.

It was this sort of thing more than the failure of any individual which made a decent peace impossible at Versailles. It is this sort of thing which prolongs the war after the war. It is this state of mind which made it possible here in the United States for a great nation to be thrown into a panic of cruelty by a few radicals. Our treatment of political prisoners, our shameful deportation raids, would never have been

possible except for the continuance of war hysteria into the times of peace.

A Problem in Psychology

Psychologists may not agree on the precise explanation of these panics of the mob mind, but all of them must agree to the stern fact that we men and women are prone to mental diseases more serious than the physical plagues with which we have learned to wrestle. We should take the same steps against the fear-hate psychology as we would against typhus. The germs of the disease cannot live in an atmosphere of truth and love. That great word of scripture " Perfect love casteth out fear " needs a social application if we are to be saved. No nation is powerful enough — not even our own — to render itself immune from war by fear of its superior might. The greater the fear of us the greater the danger that other nations may combine to wrestle with it. It is not Utopianism but sober sanity, and it certainly is sound Christianity, to affirm that the way of life for any nation is the way of love.

That is not sentimental affirmation. It means disarmament. It cuts down deep into our economics and political organization. While it is not true that any people in modern times yearn for the terrible conditions of modern warfare out of sheer lust of conquest, it is true that nations or social classes may suffer under such sense of wrong that they will be goaded into war. While the business of banishing war is in part the business of conquering the unreasoned fear-hate psychology, it is also the business of avoiding those acts which play upon fear and hate and give some basis to them.

Economics and Politics

Great nations today do not fight because they want to overrun each other. They do fight for oil, coal, iron, investment markets, control of trade routes. I do not mean that individual exploiters or soldiers deliberately say: " We shall fight for the control of oil," but they do go out and grab all they can get. They play a great poker game for the rich economic prizes of the earth. They do not scruple to use marked cards. Then some one pulls his gun. So long as certain privileged groups and certain powerful nations preempt for themselves those natural resources which are necessary for the commonwealth of the world, we have the under-

lying condition which makes for war. It is useless for us to talk of the love which casteth out fear if we belong to a social class which sees no harm in extracting all possible profit from private ownership of what was created by God or by society and which is necessary for the social good. It is equally impossible to be sincere in practicing international love if we Americans insist on holding all that our favored geographic position has given us and reaching out steadily into Latin-America for more concessions without thought of the needs of the rest of mankind.

This is not the particular subject on which I have been asked to write but it would not be possible to treat of the war-hate psychology and the cure for it without suggesting the need of economic and political arrangements which will not run counter to the mutual interdependence of all men in this age of machinery. We are debtors to the men of the frozen north and of tropical forests for the daily food, clothing and comforts of our modern civilization. We can acknowledge that debt by a cooperative organization of society, or we can add to the stories of fear and hate by following " the good old rule, the simple plan, that he should take who has the power and he should keep who can."

There is another observation that must be made. Behind the psychology of fear and hate between nations is the conception of the state as an impersonal God, superior to the moral law, sanctifying to its own ends whatsoever means it sees fit, supreme over the conscience of individuals. Men as members of the state will do what they would never dream of doing as individuals. Frenchmen as Frenchmen would never have treated individual Germans as Frenchmen blindly obedient to the state have treated Germans in the Ruhr in times of peace. It is this worship of the state, an organization of men less than humanity, but claiming all and more of the allegiance that men owe to humanity, which sets peoples and nations in unnatural opposition one to the other.

Summary

All of this is only another way of saying that the problem of peace is not purely psychological. All our problems involve not only mental attitudes but the human institutions to which those mental attitudes correspond. Yet if we bear this fundamental fact in mind, we are justified in dwelling on

the importance of fighting in our own selves and in our nation that psychology of suspicion and fear and hate which is in itself a cause of war. A great affirmation of trust and confidence in other peoples might prove for Americans the royal road to peace. That affirmation means a new teaching of history at home and new glorification not of armies or of nations but of humanity in its long struggle toward better things. It means the end of deliberate preparation for war through arms and armaments. It means the dethronement of King Profit as ruler of men and nations and the end of state worship as our highest religion. It means, in short, in our education and social organization the application of that perfect love which is the only remedy for the wounds of the world.

ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM

The Great Game for the Control of Resources and Profits and Its Inevitable Outcome

SCOTT NEARING

Imperialism is older than modern history. The earliest records tell of hill tribes migrating into valleys, enslaving the valley peoples and taking their lands and goods. The descent of the Children of Israel on the Promised Land was such an imperial conquest, on a very small scale. The large scale imperialists of classical times were the Romans. The Roman Empire was based on military conquest and economic exploitation. As soon as a province was brought under the Roman sway, the amount of its tribute was fixed, and whether in the form of money, grain, metal or ships, the new province was forced, under the threat of military compulsion, to pay its annual contribution toward the support of the Roman Empire.

There were four aspects in this imperial process: (1) Territory was conquered; (2) the populations were subjugated; (3) they were forced to pay a tribute; (4) tribute was paid to the ruling class of the Roman (conquering) state. And whether in Roman times or in modern times, these are the outstanding characteristic of imperialism.

Imperialism in Economic Guise

Roman imperialism was largely military. The Roman State conquered its provinces and held them by force of arms. Modern imperialism is chiefly economic. Military force figures only incidentally.

The greatest empire since the decline of Rome — in fact, as far as its territorial extent is concerned, the greatest empire in all history — is the British Empire. At the present time, Britain controls about one-quarter of the earth and nearly a quarter of the world's population. The character of this empire is well illustrated by the position which the British occupied at the outset of the Great War.

Britain, in 1913, was a great manufacturing, trading and commercial centre. Her Empire was based upon this economic activity. The Empire furnished raw materials. Hides

came from South Africa, wool from Australia, cotton from India, and wheat from Canada, providing food for the British factory worker and the substances out of which he was to fabricate shoes, calico, and other exportable products. The Empire also furnished the market for these goods. The people of South Africa bought back their leather in the form of shoes, the people of Australia bought their wool in the form of fabrics; the people of India repurchased their cotton as calico. These same dominions which provided the raw material for British industry, furnished the market for British finished goods. The development and maintenance of these markets involved an investment of capital. Railroads must be constructed, electric plants installed, agricultural implements furnished. British bankers met this situation by exporting their surplus capital and investing it in Canadian Railroads, in South African mines, in Australian sheep ranches. Thus the Empire provided capital investment fields as well as raw materials and markets.

At the outbreak of the World War (see *The Export of Capital*, C. K. Hobson) British investors had invested practically twenty billions of dollars in every corner of the earth that afforded an adequate guaranty of return. The building of ships and growth of banking and insurance were necessary corollaries to the raw material — manufacturing — capital investment activity in which British industrialists were engaged. (See *Imperialism*, J. A. Hobson, also *Imperialism*, L. S. Woolf.)

Rome secured her tribute in the form of taxes levied on subjugated populations. Britain secured each year, from her overseas business, more than a billion dollars of income, besides the advantages which she obtained in the form of manufacturing, trading, banking, and insurance profits.

The Rise of Economic Imperialism

Economic imperialism, or as it is sometimes called, financial imperialism, necessarily had its rise in the industrial revolution. The surplus produced in an agricultural society is very small and most of the products are sold directly in the farms and villages. It is only in a society producing vast amounts of specialized goods — shoes, calico, machinery — that great trading ventures are built up, importing raw materials, exporting finished products and capital.

Factory industry which had its rise in England in the middle of the eighteenth century, provided a large economic surplus which enabled first Britain and later Holland, France, Germany and Japan to market their surplus economic goods outside of their political boundaries.

The industrial revolution made imperialism possible. Economic imperialism is the flower of capitalism. Capitalist industry markets its surpluses at home, so long as there is any demand for them. When the volume of the surpluses gluts the home market, imperialism exports its surplus.

The Flag Follows the Investor

Thus far little has been said about the military side of modern imperialism. It has a military aspect, however. The Turkish government fails to pay interest on a loan which it has made from British bankers. The British State Department immediately intervenes in accordance with the well-established principle that "the flag follows the investor." British money in Egypt and India must be protected, otherwise no more would be invested and then what could the British industrialists do with their surpluses? The hideous opium wars waged by Britain against China, the acts of imperial aggression carried on in Africa by Britain, Belgium, France, Germany and Italy, had as their object the security and protection of investments made by the citizens of these various countries.

Flag versus Flag

Automatically, therefore, the state becomes the collecting agency for the imperialist. The State Department, the army and navy are his diplomatic and police forces. Occasionally, when by chance two groups of investors, one from Britain and another from Germany, go out in search of the same economic opportunity and come into conflict with one another as to who shall have it, the inevitable result is a disaster such as that which took place in 1914. Nobody supposes today that French textile workers, miners and railroad workers had anything against the textile workers, miners and railroad workers of Germany, but it is quite obvious that the French steel interests and the German steel interests were pitted against one another in their struggle for the iron of Lorraine and the coal of the Ruhr.

Peoples are embroiled in war without knowing when or why, because they are ignorant of the fact that " war follows in necessary sequence upon causes arising out of the processes of production, trading and financing," or that " the world is drifting more and more toward commercial conflict." They are very far from seeing that " the roots of this development are found in capitalism itself. The capitalist organization of machine production tends to produce more goods than can be sold at a profit. Capital also tends to accumulate rapidly. In other words, consumption both of goods and of capital tends to lag behind production. The capitalist class, therefore, which is in control of modern business, is constantly seeking new markets in which to dispose of goods, and new opportunities for the investment of surplus capital." Specifically, " the Great War was in large measure the result of these economic rivalries and uncertainties and the resulting alarms and fears. Its background is the struggle for colonies and for spheres of influence." (Quotations from *Raw Materials and Foodstuffs*, W. S. Culbertson, Vice-Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.)

Uncle Sam Enters the Game

Until about 1900, the United States was a rich field for foreign investments. French, Belgium, Dutch and British capitalists had placed large funds at the disposal of American railroad builders and those conducting other enterprises. But with the end of the nineteenth century, the surplus produced in American industry became so great that it began to overflow into the surrounding territories, into Mexican oil, Cuban sugar, Porto Rican tobacco, Central American fruit. Since the beginning of the World War this process has gone on with such extraordinary rapidity that in 1920 the total foreign investments of the United States were estimated at 20.6 billions. To be sure, half of this was in the form of obligations to the United States government from France, Italy and Great Britain. Foreign commercial investments had, however, become so large that the United States was already the second among the great investing nations.

American investments are very widely scattered, although the process of making them on a considerable scale has been going on for only about twenty years. The latest general compilation of these figures (*Wealth and Income of the Ameri-*

can People, W. R. Ingalls, Part III) contains a very detailed analysis of the geographic distribution of the foreign holdings of American citizens. These investments are of two general sorts: In government, state or city bonds, and in private enterprises. The debt due the United States from the British, French, Italian and Belgian governments is about eleven billions of dollars at the present time. In addition there are about two billions of dollars in government and other public bonds held by private investors. It is these bonds in the hands of private investors and the private industrial and commercial investments that constitute the real danger to world peace.

The principal commercial investments of the United States are in Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Central and South America and the Philippines. The United States Department of Commerce has published an extended study of *Investments in Latin America and the British West Indies* which specifies by countries the extent and character of these investments. This study has been supplemented by many special reports. There are, in Canada, something like two and a half billions of United States capital; in Cuba, more than seven hundred millions; about eight hundred millions in Mexico, and so on. The important fact does not relate to the amount of these investments, but to their widely extended character. The American business men are evidently busy with imperial ventures in all parts of the world.

Forces similar to those which brought the chief European nations into the conflict of 1914 are still operative in 1924. Indeed, it can fairly be said that the economic conflict is more intense now than it was before the war. For the moment the military side of the conflict is in abeyance, but each one of the great capitalist nations is making feverish preparation for the next military conflict which many intelligent observers have already predicted (see *The Next War*, Will Irwin, and *Prospects of Industrial Civilization* by Bertrand Russell). Wars were fought in old times for other than economic causes, but at the present time the economic urges to war seem to dominate all others.

The Menace of Imperialism

Nothing more instructive has been seen in a long time than the struggle for the petroleum reserves of the Near East,

a struggle waged primarily between the British Royal Dutch-Shell Transport interests and the American Standard Oil interests. The Greek and the Turk armies did the actual fighting, but the strings were pulled and the moves were planned in London and in Paris. Men, villages and whole countrysides suffered and struggled, not to produce oil, but to determine who should have the right to monopolize it and to make from it a special profit.

Huge mechanisms have been built up in the interests of financial imperialism. One feature distinguishes them, — they take no account of the happiness and the growth of men and women. And that, after all, is the most terrible indictment that can be brought against any method of social organization.

PEACE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CHURCHES

We have selected the following from among a large number of peace resolutions and declarations passed by church bodies as being representative of them all.

Northern Baptist Convention
Milwaukee, Wis., May, 1924

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

WHEREAS, We deplore the recent action of Congress which makes an unjust as well as ungracious discrimination against the people of a friendly nation, and while recognizing that a careful limitation of our immigration is necessary, we are in accord with the President in his protest to Congress against the manner in which the measure was enacted; therefore

Resolved, That we are confident that in its disregard of international amenities and needless affront of the Japanese Government, the present law does not represent the sentiment of the Christian people of America:

And, being jealous for the increasing moral and spiritual influence of the United States and desirous of removing every cause of international misunderstanding, we earnestly petition our Congress to remove the discriminatory regulations against the people of Japan and to provide means by which through proper diplomatic channels, the necessary limitations of immigration may be made in accord with the highest Christian principles of good will and mutual regard.

WAR

WHEREAS, The Christian conscience of the world is coming to recognize that war is neither inevitable nor necessary; that it is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ; that it is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts humanity today; that under modern conditions war has now become not only futile but suicidal; and that the

recognition of this fact is necessary to the continuance of *civilization;* therefore be it

Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention again declares its conviction that war is a wrong method for settling international disputes, and that because it is wrong, the church must not only condemn war, and the things which make for war, but must take an active part in discovering and promoting the things which make for peace; and be it further

Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention request the government of the United States to unite with other nations in the Permanent Court of International Justice, and to cooperate with such other agencies as promise to reduce the likelihood of war, and to create a rational system of settling international disputes in order that we may keep faith with the youth of our country who served so well in the World War which they believed would end war; and be it further

Resolved, That the Northern Baptist Convention desires to join with other religious bodies in calling a world conference to consider what can be done to promote more friendly relations among nations and to create a world conscience against war, and so to bring the power of a united Christendom to bear against the continuance of the war system; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our pastors and people to set themselves afresh to the task of creating a love of justice and a will for peace, and thus achieve the utter repudiation of war by the Christian conscience and its outlawry by the governments of the world.

Congregational Churches

Four bodies of Congregational ministers, recently in session, have faced and acted on the war issue in a way to show that that great denomination may be counted on to lead in the separation of the church from the war system. These actions, taken on the Pacific coast, in the Middle West, and in New England, may justly be regarded as symptomatic of much current thought within Congregationalism.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Congregationalists of Southern California, while in session in San Diego, May 12–14, 1924, adopted this resolution on war:

As followers of Christ we recognize our loyalty to him as supreme and sanctifying every other loyalty.

We therefore declare our opposition to the war system, involving war propaganda, war preparations, military training in our schools and colleges, race prejudice, economic exploitation, and religious intolerance as inconsistent with Christ's spirit and example.

We urge upon our government to cooperate with other nations in outlawing war as contrary to the Christian spirit.

We announce that we cannot conscientiously take part in propaganda or preparations looking toward war.

We encourage the development of our educational system to educate for peace rather than war, and the development of the spirit and the creation of the international machinery for the application of reason and good will to disputes that might lead to war.

We believe it a paramount duty of our churches to promote the program of Jesus for peace on earth and good will toward men among nations as well as among individuals.

PEACE RESOLUTION

Adopted by the Congregational Conference of Illinois, May 8, 1924

Without calling into question any previous wars or their motivation, the Illinois Conference of Congregational Churches affirms the duty and purpose of the present hour and our line of action for future days in the interest and support of preparedness for world peace, as follows:

First. We believe that the continuance of the war system as an established part of modern civilization is, in its very nature and results, anti-Christian because anti-social; and that the time has come when it must be outlawed the same as slavery and the liquor traffic.

Second. The Conference stands for open diplomacy between nations and for an International Court of Justice to interpret and apply international law in order that world peace may be secured and maintained as humanity's need and right.

Third. We also stand for the most thorough-going education of the youth of our country in the principles of peace and international relations.

Fourth. We further believe that America should be

among the leaders in securing an international covenant of peace, whereby all peoples through their representatives shall subscribe to the things which make for universal good will.

Fifth. We rejoice in the apparent success of the Dawes Commission in preparing an adequate plan for the solution of the vexed problem of reparations and we heartily commend the proposal of President Coolidge to call an international conference looking toward further disarmament.

Sixth. We are opposed to the whole war system — its secret treaties, military alliances, unjust economic concessions, competitive "preparedness" programs — and in no way will we participate in such movements as history has conclusively shown lead to war.

Seventh. No complex problem is ever rightly solved apart from full and free discussion. Prejudice and persecution not only prevent the discovering of the way to peace but they are chief factors in creating war. We therefore call upon all men of varying thoughts concerning this matter, to practice the spirit of Christ in order that they may learn the mind of Christ and may unite effectively in behalf of the principles stated in the preceding paragraphs, about which there seems to be general agreement among us.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE

When the Congregationalists of New Hampshire met in their one hundred and twenty-third annual convention at Durham, May 13–15, 1924, they passed a whole group of resolutions on the war issue. Among these a resolution offered from the floor by Rev. Roy B. Chamberlin, and adopted by the assembly, attracted most attention:

"The members present of the Congregational Conference of New Hampshire rejoice to learn of such action against war as has been recently taken by the Methodist Council of cities at Pittsburgh, and by the Methodist students' gathering at Louisville. Since it seems evident also to us that war is the most colossal and ruinous collective sin on earth, therefore,

"We are ready to say, as ministers and delegates of Christian churches, that we can never bless another war."

VERMONT CONFERENCE STATEMENT ON WAR

There is no dispute among us in the understanding of the kingdom of God. However differently we may phrase the

definition of it, and whatever diverse illustrations we employ to explain the idea, we are agreed that the all-comprehending aim of the moral and spiritual struggle of mankind is the dominance of the mind of Christ in all the earth, humanity everywhere organized according to the will of God, a transfiguration of the social order bringing into effect perfect justice, freedom, fraternity, labor, and joy.

And we are in agreement that in the condition of the world today, in such large part torn with hatreds, infused with prejudices and misunderstanding, controlled by motives of greed and selfish ambition, and ready again to see red and fight, class with class, nation with nation, and even race with race, the Church of Christ must come to the rescue of the world. The Church of Christ must come quickly, courageously, and with all the wisdom and strength she can invoke from God and secure through the singleness of purpose and unity of program of the whole fellowship of the Christian people.

We believe that the time has come for the Church of Christ to do more than take sides on tremendous questions which involve prosperity or disaster, life or death, for civilization and the world. She is summoned to *lead the way, to make a side of her own.* We believe that the true Christianity must go further than proffer suggestions to the secular powers; it ought to claim the right " to challenge, to penetrate, and to transform the whole social order." We believe that the Christian should rise up in his place and speak out in unmistakable terms, according to the way of Jesus as best he can interpret it, what he will stand for — and what he will not stand for, in all social and political affairs.

In view, then, of this basis of principle on which all thoughtful, earnest, and forward-looking Christians may come together, as touching this gravest of the great questions, that of war and peace, we delegates, ministers and laymen and women, from our Vermont Congregational churches, in annual conference assembled in Woodstock, May 13 to 15, 1924, in our individual capacity make this statement of our faith and dedication and refer it back to every Congregational church in the state for its endorsement.

1. In order to prepare the public mind for the right moral judgment upon war and to arouse the lofty passion of the people's conscience against it we shall undertake through

preaching and teaching, in the pulpit and out of it, in the church school and other educational agencies, to make known the real facts about war, as the truth has been and is being told by first-hand witnesses, and not under the gloss of appeals for patriotism and " my country right or wrong."

2. In season and out of season it is our purpose to insist that war is not inevitable, that if man has been by nature a fighting animal the time has fully come for man to slough off his old nature and become the new spiritual man in Christ Jesus, and that the establishment of permanent peace among nations and peoples is no idle dream but an attainable goal in this generation.

3. We pledge ourselves to do our part to remove the causes of war:

A. By studying them and becoming intelligent about them;

B. By going to the full limit of practising the Christian principles we have avowed, of justice, good will and brotherhood, not tolerating in ourselves racial feeling or that spirit of nationalism which disesteems any other nations and countries, and working for such changes by progressive steps in the industrial and economic organization of society-at-large as shall uproot the incentives for selfish trade rivalries and commercial exploitation and put the Golden Rule concretely into national legislation and international policy;

C. By encouraging and supporting specifically the various agencies which are now in operation or may be devised to explain the causes of war and prevent it.

4. We believe that the United States should participate in the World Court of International Justice and we will use our influence to bring about this participation. Recognizing frankly that there has been an honest difference of political opinion among us regarding our entrance into the League of Nations, we maintain now that this issue should be lifted out of the sphere of partisan debate, and decided on the highest ground; and we are persuaded that America owes to the other countries of the world the fullest cooperation in perfecting a world organization in which this government and people shall be an active member in the interest of peace and prosperity for all mankind.

5. But there is a further step to take, and we are ready for it with full understanding of its significance and with solemn

and intense purpose. Without undertaking to dictate to the individual his course of action as a citizen of the state in case of war, we nevertheless affirm that it is the duty of the Christian church to excommunicate war — to declare it for what it is, sinful in the extreme and utterly contrary to the mind of Christ, never again to apologize for it, bless it or give it official sanction. Moreover, we urge upon our government to take the initiative in proposing through international organization to put war under the ban of outlawry, to make war henceforth a crime to be visited with penalties befitting so great a crime in the person of that nation or of individuals within a nation that may be guilty of instigating it.

Report of the Special Committee of Thirteen on War

Adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Springfield, Mass., May 24, 1924

Millions of our fellow men have died heroically in "a war to end war." What they undertook must be finished by methods of peace. War is not inevitable. It is the supreme enemy of mankind. Its futility is beyond question. Its continuance is the suicide of civilization. We are determined to outlaw the whole war system.

The patriotism of the Methodist Episcopal Church has never been challenged. Neither our motives nor our loyalty must be impugned when we insist on the fulfilment of pledges made to the dead and assert our Christian ideals for the living. Governments which ignore the Christian conscience of men in time of peace cannot justly claim the lives of men in time of war. Secret diplomacy and political partisanship must not draw men into the dilemma of deciding between support of country and loyalty to Christ.

The world is now open to a crusade for peace. War-weary nations everywhere are eagerly waiting. America should lead the way. The Nation and the Church can do now what they may never, never be able to do again.

We set ourselves to create the will to peace. We recommend that a prayer for peace be prepared and used at every communion service. Through its educational program, our church must do its full share to mold the present youth of all races into a peace-loving generation. We shall launch an aggressive campaign to teach the nature, causes and consequences of war. The glorification of war must end.

We set ourselves to create the conditions for peace. Selfish nationalism, economic imperialism and militarism must cease. We demand the establishment of the principle that conscription of wealth and labor must be the counterpart of any future conscription of human life. As great odium must be put upon the war profiteer as is put upon the slacker. The protection of special privileges secured by investors in foreign lands has too often imperiled the peace of nations. This source of danger must be prevented. The rights of the smallest nation must be held as sacred as those of the strongest. We hold the cause of peace dearer than party allegiance and we shall tolerate no dilatory or evasive attitudes on the part of those who represent us.

We set ourselves to create organization for peace. Grateful to our government for leadership in the movement toward reduction of armaments and the promotion of tribunals for international arbitration, we insist upon a still more decided and aggressive policy in these directions. We urge the President of the United States to summon another Conference of the Nations for the more drastic reduction of armaments. We likewise urge upon the Senate the immediate entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice. The participation of the United States in a League of Nations will receive our active aid. We call upon all our people to support for public office men pledged to secure these ends. The ballot and other direct processes of democracy must now be employed in securing a warless world.

World Christianity is enlisting in the campaign for peace. We seek alliance with all the forces which make for the principles here advocated. We, therefore, propose that our church now assume its full share of responsibility by appointing at this General Conference a commission of twenty-five members, composed of five bishops, ten ministers, and ten laymen authorized and instructed to invite the religious forces of the world to unite in a conference to consider the best plans and methods for making the impact of a world-wide religious sentiment against the evils we deplore.

The principles of brotherhood are plainly challenged. The progress of the kingdom of Jesus Christ is clearly at stake. The issues are so momentous, the opportunity for leadership is so great, that we here and now call upon all people to avoid divisive and fruitless discussions and unite their energies in

this great movement for a warfree world. To this sublime end we dedicate ourselves, and for its accomplishment we invoke the blessing of Almighty God.

Report on Universal Peace

Adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America at Grand Rapids, Michigan, May, 1924.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America pledges all its energies to the outlawing of war and to the hastening of the day when nations shall learn war no more. We refuse to believe that the wholesale slaughter of human beings upon the battlefield is morally any more necessary to man's highest development than is killing by individuals. We see in war's cruelties, made more terrible by modern invention, not only a menace to civilization but also a definite challenge to the followers of the Prince of Peace.

We invite the cooperation of all Christendom in a determined effort to devise such complete machinery for peace as shall insure the settlement of all international controversies by reason instead of force.

To this end we favor participation by our nation with other nations in the Court of International Justice and the submission for judicial settlement, or the arbitration of disputes, and the investigation, before a resort to arms, of all differences which cannot be adjudicated or arbitrated, reserving the right to control our own destiny and to determine whether or not and when we shall declare war.

The moral influence of our nation, and the confidence of other nations in our disinterestedness, compel us to assume leadership and take a definite part in the movement for world peace. We should endeavor to secure a joint agreement for international disarmament and also for a referendum on war except in case of threatened invasion. We claim that those who are asked to fight and bear the burdens imposed by war should be consulted when possible before this sacrifice is required of them.

We solemnly assert that the teachings of Christ furnish the only basis and hope of permanent peace and earnestly appeal to all branches of the Christian Church to unite in bringing mankind to an acceptance of him in order to establish a universal brotherhood founded on righteousness, justice

and peace. We enjoin upon the Boards and Agencies of our Church, particularly the Board of Christian Education, together with our ministers and members, to do all in their power to accomplish this purpose which we believe to be in accord with the will of God and in harmony with the teachings of our Lord and Master.

Organizations in the United States of America that Promote World Peace

GROUP I

Organizations Formed Primarily to Promote World Peace

	Founded	*Approximate Membership*
American Association for International Conciliation 407 West 117th St., New York City	1907	
*American School Citizenship League 405 Marlborough St., Boston, Mass.	1908	
American Peace Society Colorado Bldg., Washington, D. C.	1828	2,500
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace $10,000,000 — $500,000 annual income 2 Jackson Pl., Washington, D. C.	1910	
*Church Peace Union 70 Fifth Ave., New York City Endowed by Andrew Carnegie — $2,000,000	1914	
Committee to Outlaw War 76 West Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.	1920	
Fellowship for a Christian Social Order 311 Division Ave., Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.		
*Fellowship of Reconciliation 396 Broadway, New York City	1915	3,000 U. S. A.
Fellowship of Youth for Peace, 396 Broadway, New York City	1924	
*Foreign Policy Association 3 West 29th St., New York City	1918	
Intercollegiate Peace Association Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio	1906	
League of Nations Non-Partisan Association 6 East 39th St., New York City	1923	
*National Council for Prevention of War 532 17th St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	1921	8,000,000 (Members affiliated organizations)
*Peace Association of Friends in America 615 National Rd., West Richmond, Ind.	1867	90,000 (Constituency represented)
Peace Committee of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends 304 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.	1915	4,550
*Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (American Branch) 1403 H St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	1915	5,000
Women's Peace Society 505 Fifth Ave., New York City	1919	2,000
*World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches 70 Fifth Ave., New York City	1914	10,000 U. S. A.

*Affiliated with National Council for Prevention of War

	Founded	Approximate Membership
World Peace Foundation 40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. Edwin Ginn Foundation — $50,000 annually	1910	

GROUP II

Organizations that Work for Peace through Special Committees

*Council of Jewish Women 305 West 98th St., New York City	1893	48,000
Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America 105 East 22d St., New York City	1908	25,000,000 (30 Protestant denominations)
Peace Committee — Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, 105 East 22d St., New York City *Chairman*, Dr. John H. Finley; *Secretary*, Dr. Sidney L. Gulick		
*National Education Association 1201 16th St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	1857	120,000
*National League of Women Voters 532 17th St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	1920	2,000,000
*National Woman's Christian Temperance Union 1730 Chicago Ave., Evanston, Ill., and 35 B St. N.W., Washington, D. C.	1874	500,000
*National Women's Trade Union League 311 Ashland Blvd., Chicago, Ill.	1903	600,000
National Conference on Christian Way of Life 129 East 52d St., New York City		

GROUP III

Organizations Engaged in Activities which Increase International Good Will and Promote World Peace

Institute of International Education 522 Fifth Ave., New York City	1919	
Junior Red Cross Department of Junior Red Cross American Red Cross Bldg., Washington, D. C.		
Corda Fratres Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs of America 305 Dentistry Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.	1903	
League for Industrial Democracy 70 Fifth Ave., New York City		
National Student Forum 2929 Broadway, New York City	1922	3,000
*United Society of Christian Endeavor World's Christian Endeavor Bldg., Mt. Vernon and Joy Sts., Boston, Mass.	1881	3,000,000 in U. S. 4,000,000 in world
World's Student Christian Federation 347 Madison Ave., New York City	1895	260,000
Young Men's Christian Association 347 Madison Ave., New York City	1854	902,673
*National Board of Young Women's Christian Association 600 Lexington Ave., New York City	1906	525,000

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON WAR AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT

All prices are subject to change

PEACE WORKERS' FILE. National Council for Prevention of War. 532 17th St. N.W., Washington, D. C., $1.50.

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

LEAGUE OF NATIONS. Edited by Duggan. Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston, 1919, 357 pp., $2.50.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. Bryce Macmillan, New York, 1922, 275 pp., $2.50.

EVOLUTION OF WORLD PEACE. Marvin. Oxford Press, New York, 1921, 191 pp., $3.20.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN HISTORY. Pollard. Oxford Press, New York, 1919, 14 pp., $0.10.

THE NATURE OF PEACE. Veblen. Huebsch, New York, 1919, 367 pp., $2.50.

THE PEACE PROBLEM. John Bassett Moore. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Pamphlet.

WAYS TO PEACE. Edited by Esther Everett Lape.

WAR AND HUMAN NATURE

MUTUAL AID. Kropotkin. Knopf, New York, 1917, 240 pp., $1.75.

THE BIOLOGY OF WAR. Nicolai. Century, New York, 1918, 553 pp., $3.50.

WAR AND THE BREED. Jordan. Beacon Press, Boston, 1915, 265 pp., $1.60.

SOCIAL PROGRESS. Nasmyth. Putnam, New York. (Out of print.)

THE MORAL EQUIVALENT OF WAR. James. American Association for International Conciliation, New York, 1910. Pamphlet.

WAR AND CHRISTIANITY

THE CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR A WARLESS WORLD. Gulick. Federal Council of Churches, New York, 1922, 197 pp., $0.50.

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR. Cadoux. Headley Bros., London, 1919, 272 pp., 10s. 6d.

THE ABOLITION OF WAR. Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page. Doran, 1924, 93 pp., $0.15.

WAR. Page. Doran, 1923, 89 pp., $0.15.

THE SWORD OR THE CROSS. Page. Doran, New York, 1922, 53 pp., $0.15.

ON THE TRAIL OF PEACEMAKERS. Smith. Macmillan, New York, 1922, 239 pp., $1.75.

NEW WARS FOR OLD. Holmes. Dodd, Mead Co., New York, 1916. (Out of print.)

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PEACE. Edited by Hastings. Scribner, New York, 1922, 300 pp., $4.00.

WHAT THE WAR HAS TAUGHT US. Jefferson. Revell Co., New York, 1919, 258 pp., $1.50.

TOWARDS THE BROTHERHOOD OF NATIONS. Student Christian Movement, London, 1922, 3s. 6d.

LABOR AND WAR

Why Men Fight. Russell. Century, New York, 1917, 212 pp., $1.75.
Causes of International War. Dickinson. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1920, 110 pp., $1.00.

ECONOMICS AND WAR

Where Iron Is, There is the Fatherland. Streit. Huebsch, New York, 1921, 52 pp., $0.50.
The Fruits of Victory. Angell. Century, New York, 1921, 400 pp., $3.00.
America and the Balance Sheet of Europe. Bass & Moulton, Ronald Press, 1921, New York, 361 pp., $3.00.
Revision of the Treaty. Keynes. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1922, 242 pp., $2.00.
Economic Consequences of the Peace. Keynes. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1920, 298 pp., $2.50.
The Economics of Reparations. Hobson. Allen & Unwin, London, 1921, 32 pp., 1s.
The War of Steel and Gold. Brailsford. G. Bell & Sons, London, 1914, 340 pp., 4s. 6d.
The Economic Foundations of Peace. Garvin. Macmillan, New York, 1919, 574 pp., $3.25.
The Great Illusion. Angell. Putnam, New York, 1911, 416 pp., $1.50.
Economic Imperialism. Woolf. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1920, 111 pp., $1.00.
War: Its Nature, Cause and Cure. Dickinson. Macmillan, New York, 155 pp., $1.50.

WOMEN AND WAR

Peace and Bread. Jane Addams. Macmillan, New York, 1922, 257 pp., $1.75.

THE LAST WAR AND THE NEXT WAR

The Next War. Irwin. Dutton, New York, 1921, 161 pp., $1.50.
The Folly of Nations. Palmer. Dodd, Mead & Co., 1921, New York, 408 pp., $2.00.
Now It can be Told. Gibbs. Harper Bros., New York, 1920, 558 pp., $3.00.
The Myth of a Guilty Nation. Nock. Huebsch, New York, 1922, 114 pp., $1.00.
Patriotism and the Responsibility for the War. Demartial. Huebsch, New York, 1921, 57 pp., $0.50.
How Diplomats Make War. Neilson. Huebsch, New York, 1916, 382 pp., $2.00.
Disenchantment. Montague. Brentano, New York, 1922, 280 pp., $2.00.
Christ or Mars. Irwin. Appleton, New York, 1923, 188 pp., $1.50.
The Inexcusable Lie. Peat. Barse & Hopkins, New York City, 186 pp., $1.50.

THE WORLD TODAY

An Introduction to World Politics. Gibbons. Century, New York, 1922, 595 pp., $4.00.
The Decadence of Europe. Nitti. Holt, New York, 1923, 300 pp., $3.00.
After the Peace. Brailsford. Seltzer, New York, 1922, 158 pp., $1.50.
The New Map of Asia. Gibbons. Century, New York, 1919, 400 pp., $3.00.
Whither France — Whither Europe. Caillaux. Knopf, New York, 1923, 184 pp., $2.50.

An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. Grant. Macmillan, New York, 1916. (Out of print.)

The Malady of Europe. Ravage. Macmillan, New York, 1923, 250 pp., $2.00.

The Stakes of Diplomacy. Lippman. Holt, New York, 1915, 235 pp., $1.40.

Europe in Convalescence. Zimmern. Putnam, New York, 1922, 237 pp., $2.50.

Democracy's International Law. Ralston. Byrne & Co., Washington, D. C., 1922, 165 pp., $1.50.

Nationalism, War and Society. Krehbiel. Macmillan, New York, 1916, 276 pp., $1.75.

What Shall I Think of Japan? Gleason. Macmillan, New York, 1921, 284 pp., $2.25.

The Problem of China. Russell. Century, New York, 1922, 260 pp., $2.00.

Problems in Pan-Americanism. Inman. Doran, New York, 1921, 415 pp., $2.00.

League or War. Fisher. Harper Bros., New York, 1923, 286 pp., $2.50.

Germany's Capacity to Pay. Moulton & McGuire. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1923, 384 pp., $2.50.

WORLD ORGANIZATION

Selected Quotations on Peace and War. Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22d St., New York, 540 pp., $1.00.

The Two Hague Conferences. Hull. Ginn & Co., Boston. (Out of print.)

The League of Nations Today. Williams. Holt, New York, 1923, 218 pp., $2.25.

Pamphlets

The United States and the Permanent Court of International Justice. American Association for International Conciliation, 1923, 407 West 117th St., New York City.

Handbook on the League of Nations. World Peace Foundation, 1923, 40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass. Single copy free.

Current Material on the League of Nations. League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, 15 West 37th St., New York City.

Outlawry of War; — Speech, Resolution and Material. Senator Borah. American Committee for the Outlawry of War, 76 West Monroe St., Chicago, Ill.

FICTION

The Three Soldiers. Passos. Doran, New York, 1921, $2.00.

War and Peace. Tolstoi. John Lane Co., New York, 1911, 1536 pp., $1.25.

The Woman of Knockaloe. Caine. Dodd, Mead Co., New York, 1923, 187 pp., $1.75.

Plumes. Laurence Stallings. Harcourt, Brace & Co., N. Y., 1924, $2.00.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall